



Author Camden Society
Class. No. DA 20 (3:9)
Session No. 21584
SERIAL



23 1238307 9

Donor

Year



QUEEN MARY
AND WESTFIELD COLLEGE
UNIVERSITY OF LONDON

THE LIBRARY

WITHDRAWN
FROM STOCK
QMUL LIBRARY

MAIN LIBRARY
QUEEN MARY, UNIVERSITY OF LONDON
Mile End Road, London E1 4NS

DATE DUE FOR RETURN

--	--	--

021584
28.11.51

STATE TRIALS
OF THE
REIGN OF EDWARD THE FIRST
1289-1293

PRINTED BY
SPOTTISWOODE AND CO. LTD., NEW-STREET SQUARE
LONDON

STATE TRIALS
OF THE
REIGN OF EDWARD THE FIRST
1289—1293

EDITED FOR THE ROYAL HISTORICAL SOCIETY

BY

T. F. TOUT, M.A.

PROFESSOR OF MEDIEVAL AND MODERN HISTORY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF MANCHESTER

AND

HILDA JOHNSTONE, B.A.

JONES FELLOW OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MANCHESTER

LONDON

OFFICES OF THE ROYAL HISTORICAL SOCIETY

3 OLD SERJEANTS' INN, CHANCERY LANE, W.C.

1906



PREFACE

SEVERAL years ago my attention was called by Mr. Hubert Hall to two plea rolls preserved in the Public Record Office, containing the official proceedings of the trials of the judges and other royal officers, before a special Commission appointed by Edward I. in 1289. The smaller of the two rolls was copied out, and I undertook to edit it for the Camden Series. Further investigation soon showed the undesirability of publishing the record as it stands, for reasons which are set forth later. Here it need only be said that the smaller roll only contains a portion of the proceedings of the Commission, and that the more bulky roll which includes the rest had also to come within the editor's purview. An unusual press of literary and academic work made it impracticable for me to spend sufficient consecutive time in London to work through its contents. Accordingly the project slumbered for some time, until last summer I had the good fortune to associate with myself in the labour my pupil, Miss Hilda Johnstone, B.A., Jones Fellow of the University of Manchester, who kindly undertook the ungrateful office of completing the task that I had been unable to accomplish. The results of our work are now offered to the public.

I am able to assume responsibility for the plan of the publication, the correctness of the texts transcribed from Roll 541 B, the general character of the appendices, and the scope of the

introduction, but it is only fair to Miss Johnstone to state clearly that the great bulk of the work has been done by her, and that without her timely help the volume would not have been published for many a long day. In particular, she has composed the whole of the introduction. Moreover, Appendices II. and III., with the tabulated summary of the cases contained in the two rolls, are entirely due to her initiative and perseverance. It is hoped that the summary may minimise the objections to the publication of mere excerpts by serving as an indication to students of the general contents of the whole record, and by providing them with materials for easily checking our work by reference to the rolls themselves.

Nothing remains save the pleasant task of expressing our thanks to those who have aided us. To Mr. Hubert Hall a special debt of gratitude is due, not only for suggesting the whole scheme, but also for the immense amount of personal trouble he has taken to help us with his advice and assistance at every stage of the undertaking. We are also indebted to Miss Katharine Trice Martin for the careful and accurate transcript which she has made of the smaller roll, and from which we have derived the extracts which form the central part of our publication. We are obliged to my colleague, Mr. A. G. Little, for help in deciphering the All Souls' MS. of the 'Passio,' and to Professor C. Vaughan, of Leeds, who has kindly assisted us in tracking out the references to the Vulgate imbedded in the 'Passio.' To Mr. G. J. Turner we must record our gratitude for his ever-ready help and kindness. He has been good enough to read the book in proof, and to make many suggestions of the utmost value. Further, he has allowed us to draw continually upon his store of experience and legal knowledge for the solution of problems which from time to time arose. Nor must we omit our grateful acknowledgments

of our obligations to Professor F. W. Maitland, the pioneer of all recent work in setting forth the legal records of the Middle Ages, and the master of all who attempt to follow in his footsteps. We owe him our gratitude not only for the example and stimulus of his own inimitable editions, but also more especially for calling our attention to the 'Passio' of the judges, which we have published in an appendix as a slight relief to the dullness of the mass of our book. And lastly, I myself must claim the indulgence of the Royal Historical Society for having so long delayed to discharge the obligation that I had undertaken, and once more express my gratitude to my collaborator for her self-sacrifice in postponing independent work of her own in order to complete the task that I was unable to carry through single-handed.

T. F. Tout.

THE UNIVERSITY, MANCHESTER:

September 1905.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
PREFACE	v
INTRODUCTION	xi

SELECT CASES FROM ROLL 541 B.

1. The Abbot of Roche <i>v.</i> Justices of the Bench, 13 & 14 Edw. I., and especially William de Brompton	1
2. William de Durnford <i>v.</i> Richard de Boyland	5
3. Richard Maille <i>v.</i> Richard de Boyland and Solomon de Rochester	11
4. Alice, daughter of Hugh de Broadwinsor, <i>v.</i> Henry de Bray	17
5. Roger de Thornton <i>v.</i> William de Brompton	18
6. John, son of Roger de Reed, <i>v.</i> John de Chertsey	24
7. Henry le Keu and Agnes his wife <i>v.</i> John de Chester	25
8. Henry de la Legh and Nicholas de Cerne <i>v.</i> Ralph de Hengham, William de Brompton, and William de Saham; and, 8a, in connection, William de Saham <i>v.</i> John de Cave	27, 40
9. William de Camville <i>v.</i> Ralph de Hengham	46
10. William de Bardwell <i>v.</i> Ralph de Hengham	49
11. Thomas Silvester <i>v.</i> Roger de Lincoln	51
12. John, son of Hubert de Harlow, <i>v.</i> John de Lovetot	53

	PAGE
13. Thomas, prior of St. Mary de Butley, <i>v.</i> John de Lovetot . . .	62
14. Henry, son of Nicholas, <i>v.</i> Solomon de Rochester	67
15. Robert, son of Simon, <i>v.</i> William de Saham	71
16. Hugh le Taylor <i>v.</i> Ralph de Sandwich, Gregory de Rokesle, and John de Bakewell	78
17. Robert Herizarde <i>v.</i> Thomas de Sedgefield	80
18. Thomas de Goldington and his wife <i>v.</i> Nicholas de Stapleton . .	81
19. Peter de Cropredy <i>v.</i> Adam de Stratton	85
20. Roger Goodman <i>v.</i> Adam de Stratton	90
21. Attorney to Abbot of Saint-Évroult <i>v.</i> Thomas de Weyland . . .	91

APPENDICES

I. THE PASSION OF THE JUDGES	93
II. ANALYSIS OF ROLL 541 A	100
III. ANALYSIS OF ROLL 541 B	202
INDEX	255

INTRODUCTION

ON Friday, August 12, 1289,¹ Edward I. returned from his visit to Gascony. He had left England in May 1286,² taking with him the Chancellor and the Great Seal. For three years, then, the country had been free from his personal supervision, and the legislation of 1275-1285 left to bear the test of its deviser's absence.

What was the result? A universal outcry greeted him on his return. The 'clamor miserorum' rose bitterly, crying shame on the savagery, injustice, and venality of the royal officers, great and small. The generalisation concerning Edward I., 'never was a king worse served by his instruments,' was proved again true. From his justices and officials of trust, down to the humblest of his subordinates, all apparently had seized the opportunity of their master's absence to extort money, pervert justice, use their official position to serve their private ends.

The tidings must have been maddening to the order-loving King. Difficult as it always is to dogmatise about the character of a mediæval ruler, to discriminate between his own actions and those of the lawyers and advisers writing in his name, yet one is told enough of Edward I. by contemporary evidence and his own work to see in him a man with an instinct for orderliness, a man

¹ *Cal. Close Rolls, Edw. I.*, 1288-1296, p. 17; *Cal. Pat. Rolls, Edw. I.*, 1281-1292, p. 318; *Fædera*, I. part ii. p. 711.

² *Cal. Close Rolls, Edw. I.*, 1279-1288, p. 395; *Fædera*, I. part ii. p. 665.

of passion and determination, truer than most, in an age when promises went for little, to his own motto of 'Pactum serva.' Aided by his chancellor Burnell, Edward had for the last twenty years been legislating, systematising, tranquillising. Not only had he re-established the strength of the Crown after the troubles of his father's reign, not only had he extended his rule over North Wales, and brought the unsettled borders under firmer jurisdiction; not only had he tightened his grasp upon the greater and more unruly nobles; but he had found time to concern himself with the minutiae of judicial procedure. Effectiveness and swiftness were the keynotes of his legislation in this department. His very first statute (Statute of Westminster I., 1275) devoted twenty-nine out of its forty-five clauses to judicial matters, the definition of procedure, means to avoid delays, and so forth. In the same year followed the *Officium Coronatoris*. The Statute of 'Rageman' (1276) supplemented the Statute of Westminster. The Statute of Gloucester (1278) busied itself with procedure in assizes of novel disseisin etc. Then, because 'certain cases wherein the law failed remained undetermined, and some remained to be enacted,' the Statute of Westminster II. followed in 1285, dealing chiefly with land, but including certain clauses of more general bearing. All this shows that Edward had devoted considerable thought to judicial matters, and might well think it safe to leave the country awhile. To find his confidence abused and his legislation a dead letter must have been a heavy blow. However, this new trouble was faced with his usual promptness. The first record we have of the matter is a writ to the sheriffs on the close roll, dated October 13, 1289.¹ The King, it states, has appointed John de Pontoise, Bishop of Winchester, Robert Burnell, Bishop of Bath and Wells, Henry Lacy, Earl of Lincoln, John de St. John, William le Latimer, William de Louth, William de March, 'ad audiendum gravamina et injurias si que per ministros illata fuerint quibuscunque personis

¹ *Fœdera*, I. part ii. p. 715; *Cal. Close Rolls, Edw. I.*, 1288-1296, p. 55.

regni.' These commissioners are to report to the King at his next Parliament. If any man has a grievance, let him come to Westminster on the morrow of St. Martin (November 12).

The immediate result of this inquiry was the gradual removal of the greatest offenders. Thomas de Weyland, Chief Justice of Common Pleas, the first to suffer, was starved into submission after an ignominious flight, and finally by his own choice abjured the realm. Ralph de Hengham,¹ Chief Justice of the King's Bench, Adam de Stratton, a high official in the Exchequer, Henry de Bray, Escheator and Justice of the Jews, William de Brompton, John de Lovetot, and others, were imprisoned and fined.

This weeding of the judicial bench was dramatic and made an impression. The chroniclers almost all record it,² and it has been referred to by some modern historians.³ The incident, however, seems worthy of more precise investigation than it has yet obtained. For three years 'auditores querelarum' were sitting at Westminster, and their proceedings were noted in two bulky assize rolls now preserved in the Public Record Office. An examination of these will give an adequate idea of the nature and extent of the evil, and of the remedies used to cure it.

¹ Hengham was still described as a justice on 18 Jan., 1290, as was William de Saham; Solomon de Rochester was still a judge on 4 Jan. (*Cal. Patent Rolls Edward I.*, 1281-1292, p. 395.) On 15 Jan., 1290, Lovetot, Brompton, Roger de Leicester, and Littlebury were the judges before whom Adam de Stratton was arraigned. (*Ann. London.* p. 98.) Stratton, like Weyland, had his fate settled before the fall of his colleagues.

² *Annales Londonienses*, p. 97; *Annals of Dunstable*, p. 355-357; Bartholomew Cotton, *Hist. Anglicana*, pp. 171-173, 175-176, 180; T. Wykes, *Chronicon*, pp. 319-322; *Annals of Waverley*, p. 408; *Annals of Bermondsey*, p. 467; *Flores Historiarum*, iii. p. 70; *Peckham Letters*, iii. p. 968 (all in *Rolls Series*); Walter of Hemingburgh, *Chronicon*, ii. p. 16 (*Eng. Hist. Soc.*).

³ Stubbs, *Constitutional History*, ii. p. 125; Pauli, *Geschichte von England*, iv. 50-51; Seeley, *Life and Reign of Edward I.*, pp. 75 and 76. This latter account may be considered an evidence of the need for further investigation. It accepts without hesitation the case against the judges as 'fearful,' but gives no more detailed crimes than 'the judges were corrupt, and for bribes would release the robber and the murderer.'

The Rolls.

The rolls are numbered for reference 541 A and 541 B. Each consists of membranes of parchment some nine inches wide and varying in length from twenty to thirty-five inches, strung together at the head, and written generally upon both sides. The roll numbered 541A is by far the larger, consisting of seventy-seven membranes, as compared with forty-six in the other. It is in the shorter roll, however, that on the whole the most interesting cases are dealt with; with this, 541B, we shall be mainly concerned. Blanks have been left in the originals for the insertion of details in later stages of the proceedings. ('Postea venerunt,' etc., runs the form.) The clerk has evidently sat with notes and documents before him, weaving them into a fair copy. At times he has been betrayed into setting out the actual words of the writ before him, and fails to change construction or person suitably. 'Preceptum est vicecomiti quod distringas,' he writes on more than one occasion.¹

In this connection it is interesting to note that the actual names of the clerks who wrote the rolls, and the payments made to them, are preserved on the Liberate and Issue rolls. The following are the facts:

John de Bradford was employed as third clerk to the auditors, 'circa composicionem et ordinacionem rotulorum de querelis factis coram Archidiacono Norwycensi apud Westmonasterium' from the quindene of St. Martin 17 Edw. I to Hilary 18 Edw. I.² He was paid £3.

¹ An example occurs in 541 B, m. 21, where the clerk's attention to the heated and triumphant reply of John de Cave to William de Saham leads him to set down the exact words: the accused has made a statement 'before you, the auditors, who have record and who represent the person of the King.' He then falls once more into the third person. The extract is quoted on p. 44.

² Liberate Roll, Michaelmas, 18 and 19 Edw. I., No. 55, m. 2.

Nicholas de Tickhill, clerk to the bishops of Winchester and Bath and Wells and their colleagues, wrote rolls from the quindene of Hilary 17 Edw. I. to the Saturday before Ash Wednesday, 19 Edw. I.; and again from Ash Wednesday 19 Edw. I. to the following Christmas.¹ He received £15, £5 for the former period, £10 for the latter.²

Henry de Lichfield was employed as fourth clerk from the first day in the octave of Michaelmas to the vigil of St. Nicholas, and from the Friday after Hilary to the Friday before Ash Wednesday, 19 Edw. I.³ He was paid 1s. a day—£4 14s. in all. Again, he was employed as third clerk from the Monday next after the feast of St. John before the Latin Gate, 19 Edw. I., to the vigil of St. Margaret next following, and from the octave of St. Michael in the same year to the vigil of St. Lucy the Virgin, 20 Edw. I.⁴ For this he was paid £5.

Thus we have only three names given and no clue to the exact significance of the 'third clerk,' 'fourth clerk,' etc., or the curiously different rates of pay.

The rolls are of a fairly uniform legibility. Their difficulties are mainly those common to all thirteenth-century MSS.—similarity of form in m, n, u, i, and other letters. Where the parchment is fairly preserved, the actual transcription presents few serious difficulties. Unfortunately, however, almost every membrane is grievously torn and defaced, especially towards the foot. An example will show how great has been the difficulty of producing a continuous and intelligible text in the extracts. On membrane 13 of roll B a case is recorded touching one of the most

¹ Liberate Roll, Michaelmas, 18 and 19 Edw. I., No. 55, m. 3.

² £10 according to Liberate Roll, Michaelmas, 19 and 20 Edw. I. No. 59, m. 1; but only £5 according to Issue Roll (Pells), Michaelmas, 19 & 20 Edw. I., No. 51, m. 1.

³ Liberate Roll, Michaelmas, 18 and 19 Edw. I., No. 55, m. 2.

⁴ Ibid., 19 and 20 Edw. I., No. 59, m. 2.

important culprits, Adam de Stratton. In its present state the membrane contains 81 lines, though it may have been much longer when uninjured. Of these the first twenty are intact. At the twenty-first begins a crooked tear from right to left which continues to the foot. From line 21 to 48 it is possible to fill up the gaps conjecturally, for not more than three or four words have vanished in each line. The remaining thirty-three lines, however, make conjecture hazardous, each requiring six to fifteen words to complete it. This case is printed on page 85, as its importance seemed to demand, and may serve as a type of the system we have adopted throughout. Where the space left vacant is small or the general drift of the meaning clear, the gaps have been filled up by words inserted between square brackets. These are intended merely to conjecturally complete the sentence on lines suggested by the text. They do not pretend to reproduce necessarily the exact words of the original writer. In more difficult cases, however, or where the lacuna extends to a large number of words, the deficiency is supplied by rows of dots, longer or shorter, to indicate the size of the vacant space. Finally, in cases where so little of the original remains that it is useless to print it, several lines of dots and a side-note show the extent of the omission. It is with great reluctance that we have been driven to present so partial a text; but the choice lay between this course and neglecting many cases, valuable and interesting even in their fragmentary state.

Another crucial problem is chronology. The dating of membranes is unsystematic. In 77 membranes in Roll A, written front and back, only 72 entries of date are made; and in B, 30 entries occur on the 46 membranes. Often, too, merely the period of the year, not the year concerned, is given.

It may be useful to insert here lists of the dated membranes in the order in which they occur in the rolls.

Roll A.

Membranes.

1. Easter term, 18 Edward I.
- 2 to 4d. Quindene and third week of Easter in above year.
- 6 and 6d. Third week and month of Easter in above year.
- 7 and 7d. Easter term in above year.
- 8 and 8d. Third week and month of Easter in above year.
- 9 to 12. Easter term in above year.
- 12d. Trinity term, 18 Edward I.
13. Octave and quindene of Trinity.
- 14d. Octave of Trinity in above year.
- 15 and 15d. Quindene of Trinity.
- 16d. to 17d. Quindene and third week of Trinity.
19. Octave of Trinity in above year.
- 19d. Octave and quindene of Trinity.
20. Quindene of Trinity.
- 21 and 21d. Quindene and third week of Trinity.
22. Third week of Trinity.
- 23 and 23d. Quindene and third week of Trinity.
24. Third week of Trinity.
- 24d. Third week of Trinity and morrow of St. John the Baptist.
25. Easter term in above year.
- 26 to 27d. Morrow and octave of St. John the Baptist.
- 28 and 28d. Third week of Trinity.
29. Morrow of St. John the Baptist.
- 30 and 30d. Octave of St. John the Baptist.
- 31 to 32d. Morrow and octave of St. John the Baptist.
- 33 and 33d. Easter term, 18 Edward I.
34. Michaelmas term in above year.
35. Octave and quindene of Michaelmas.
- 35d. Quindene of Michaelmas.
- 36 to 37. Octave of Michaelmas.
38. Quindene and third week of Michaelmas.
- 38d. Month of Michaelmas and morrow of All Souls.
- 39 and 39d. Quindene and third week of Michaelmas.
- 40d. Quindene and third week of Michaelmas.
41. Month of Michaelmas and morrow of All Souls.
- 42 and 42d. Month of Michaelmas and morrow of All Souls.

Membranes.

- 43 and 43d. Morrow of All Souls.
46. Michaelmas term in aforesaid year.
47. Quindene of St. Martin.
48. Hilary term, 19 Edward I.
48d. Octave and quindene of Hilary.
49 and 49d. Quindene of Hilary.
50 and 50d. Octave and quindene of Hilary.
51. Third week of the Purification of the Virgin.
52 and 52d. Morrow of the Purification.
53 and 53d. Hilary term.
54. Octave and quindene of Hilary.
55 and 55d. Octave of Hilary.
58. Easter term, 19 Edward I.
59 and 60. Third week of Easter.
61. Third week and month of Easter.
61d. Octave of Trinity.
62. Third week of Easter.
62d. Month of Easter.
63 to 64d. Third week of Easter.
65. Easter term.
65d. Third week of Easter.
66 and 66d. Octave of Trinity.
67. Octave of Trinity and St. John the Baptist.
67d. Trinity term.
68. Octave of Trinity and St. John.
69. Octave of Trinity and St. John.
69d and 70. Octave of Trinity and quindene of St. John.
70d. Quindene of St. John.
71. Octave and quindene of St. John.
72. Michaelmas term, 19 Edward I.
72d. Octave of Michaelmas.
73. Octave and quindene of Michaelmas.
74 to 75. Octave and quindene of Michaelmas.
75d. Morrow of All Souls.
76d. Octave of St. Andrew the Apostle.
77 and 77d. Octave and quindene of St. Martin.

Roll B.

Membranes.

1. Three weeks from Easter, 20 Edw. I.
1. Octave of Michaelmas, 20 Edw. I.
1. Octave of Trinity, 20 Edw. I.
2. Quindene of Easter, 21 Edw. I.
2. Trinity term, 21 Edw. I.
3. Octave of Hilary, 20 Edw. I.
- 3d. }
(second half) } Quindene of Easter, 20 Edw. I.
4. Morrow of All Souls and St. Andrew.
5. Morrow of All Souls, 19 Edw. I.
6. Quindene of St. John the Baptist.
7. Octave of St. John the Baptist, 19 Edw. I.
8. Trinity term, 19 Edw. I.
10. Quindene of Hilary and morrow of Purification.
- 11d. Octave of Purification.
- 12d. Michaelmas term, 19 Edw. I.
23. Hilary term, 19 Edw. I.
- 24d. Octave of Trinity, 19 Edw. I.
- 25d. Quindene of Hilary, 19 Edw. I.
29. Quindene of Purification.
30. Octave and quindene of Purification.
32. After Easter and after Trinity, 18 Edw. I.
33. Month of Michaelmas, 18 Edw. I.
36. Month and five weeks.
37. Trinity term, 20 Edw. I.
38. Hilary term, 20 Edw. I.
42. Easter term, 20 Edw. I.
- 42d. Easter term.
- 43d. Third week of Easter.
44. Trinity term, 20 Edw. I.
Trinity term.

The above two lists show at a glance that the membranes are in some confusion. No catchword or other evidence exists to indicate the order. However, the disorderly arrangement in other records, where the original continuous stitching proves that such

arrangement was contemporary, prepares us to believe that here, too, the membranes were thus arranged at the date of the proceedings.

To deduce the date of a membrane from its position, early or late in the roll, or even to assume a membrane's date to be the same *in dorso* as *in recto*,¹ is therefore unsafe.

It is, then, only possible to make general statements as to the chronology of the rolls. The record of 541A extends from Easter, 18 Edward I., to the octave of St. Andrew, 19 Edward I., while 541B extends from 'after Easter and Trinity,' 18 Edward I., to Trinity term, 21 Edward I. In brief, the trials lasted for more than three years, from April 1290 to the summer of 1293.

A rough calendar of the years in question may be found helpful.

Regnal Year of Edward I.	Annus Domini	Easter Day	Ascension Day	Trinity Sunday	Corpus Christi Day
18	{ Nov. 20, 1289 } { Nov. 20, 1290 }	April 2	May 11	May 28	June 1
19	{ Nov. 20, 1290 } { Nov. 20, 1291 }	April 22	May 31	June 17	June 21
20	{ Nov. 20, 1291 } { Nov. 20, 1292 }	April 6	May 15	June 1	June 5
21	{ Nov. 20, 1292 } { Nov. 20, 1293 }	March 29	May 7	May 24	May 28

¹ Cf. membrane 29, roll 541 B, dated quindene of Hilary *in dorso* and quindene of Purification *in recto*. Yet the assumption would be in many cases correct, as we know from internal evidence. In roll 541 B, for instance, m. 10 is dated Hilary 1291. On the dorso an entry acknowledges receipt of money from Roger de Leicester by Hugh de Gosebeke. This money we know was to be paid at Hilary, 1291 (m. 33). *In dorso*, therefore, as *in recto*, the date of m. 10 is Hilary 1291. This assumption, if invariably safe, would often help to determine dates. In 541 B, again, m. 4 is dated 'the morrow of All Souls and St. Andrew,' without the addition of the year. An entry upon it records the non-appearance of Chertsey in the case of Reed v. Chertsey, and an order to the Bishop of Ely to produce him by fifteen days after Hilary. On membrane 3d his appearance is recorded, and if we may assume that 3d is the same date as 3, the appearance was in Hilary 1292. The year 1291, then, may be added to 'the morrow of All Souls' as the date of the order to the Bishop.

The law terms (Hilary, Easter, Trinity, and Michaelmas) in those years were probably as follows: ¹

Regnal Year	Hilary Term	Easter Term	Trinity Term	Michaelmas Term
18	{ Jan. 23 or 24 Feb. 12 or 13 }	{ April 19 May 15 }	{ June 7 June 21 }	{ Oct. 9 or 10 Nov. 28 or 29 }
19	Do.	{ April 29 June 4 }	{ June 27 July 11 }	Do.
20	Do.	{ April 23 May 19 }	{ June 11 June 25 }	Do.
21	Do.	{ April 15 May 11 }	{ June 3 June 17 }	Do.

The Court of Inquiry.

The original seven commissioners, already mentioned, were as follows:—Robert Burnell, Bishop of Bath and Wells; Henry Lacy, Earl of Lincoln; John de Pontoise Bishop of Winchester; John de St. John; William le Latimer; William de March; and William de Louth.

It is easy to see what motive directed the King's choice of these seven. He had been grossly deceived by the highest among his servants; the commissioners who investigated must be men whose loyalty was beyond all suspicion. All are famous names. Burnell had been chancellor since 1274, and until his death, in 1292, remained the King's closest adviser and faithful helper. Henry Lacy, Earl of Lincoln, occupied a similar position among the laymen on the commission. His life, extending into the reign of Edward II., was one long story of service to the Crown and of loyalty which burned so clear as to still follow the great King's weaker son. William de March, clerk of the King's wardrobe since 1285, and raised in 1290 to be treasurer, was a follower of Burnell's, and succeeded his master in 1293 as Bishop of Bath and Wells. John de Pontoise, consecrated in 1282 Bishop of Winchester, was continually chosen throughout the reign for missions of

¹ These terms are calculated according to Sir H. Nicolas, *Chronology of History*, p. 385.

trust beyond the seas and in Scotland. William le Latimer and John de St. John were tried soldiers of the King. The former was prominent in every campaign from the first Welsh war onwards, and often in command. The latter similarly fought for the King in many battles, beginning his history as governor of Porchester Castle, and active continually thenceforth both in camp and council. His name is chiefly associated with Gascony, where he not only fought with distinction, but ruled with success as seneschal. William de Louth, made Bishop of Ely in 1290, completes the array of commissioners.

Such was the commission appointed by the original writ. Did it continue to sit throughout the whole period of the trials?

No fresh appointment is recorded on patent or close rolls,¹ yet it is certain that fresh members entered the board. Probably the explanation is that while in theory the same commission continued to sit, the preoccupations of its chief members in these busy years led to others coming forward as their substitutes, the original seats, however, being reserved for the original members when they found it possible to be present.

Such an explanation is consonant with the evidence afforded by the rolls themselves. From time to time entries show the original board in session. In membrane 21d of Roll B, for instance,² we find that 'Ralph came . . . before the Bishops of Winchester and Bath, the Earl of Lincoln, William le Latimer, John de St. John, Master William de March and William de Louth.' In B, membrane 12d (Michaelmas, 1291), a day is given on the morrow of St. Andrew 'because the Earl of Lincoln will then be there.' Again, in B, m. 16d, we read that on December 10,

¹ The fact that no formal record on the rolls survives does not absolutely exclude the possibility of new appointments. Cf. *Collectanea Anglo-Premontrensia*, Gasquet, vol. i., p. 185, where letters of protection to the Abbot of Shap, dated 26 Oct., 1466, are given. These, though of undoubted authenticity, were never entered in the patent roll for the year. It is rash to assume any negative from the silence or carelessness of a mediæval clerk.

² Not dated.

[1292], 'auditores non fuerunt in curia tunc nisi tantum W. le Latymer.' In January [1293] the parties to this case again appeared. However, 'quia comes Lincolnie tunc fuit in partibus transmarinis in negotiis domini Regis,¹ et Johannes de Sancto Johanne similiter, non fuit ibi aliquis auditorum qui in hujusmodi placito posset cognoscere, quia tangit coronam, preter W. le Latymer.'

Undoubtedly, then, the original members were regarded as still holding office.

The actual headings of the membranes, however, are somewhat different. They are as follows:

In A. 'Coram magistro Thoma de Skernygges archidiacono Norwicensi et sociis suis.'

In B. i. 'Coram J. Wyntoniensi episcopo et sociis.'

ii. 'Coram Petro de Leycestre et sociis.'

Peter de Leicester apparently sat from 1292; the Bishop of Winchester through 1290 and 1291. Thomas de Scarning sat from April 1290 to November 1291.

Only one of these three was appointed in the original writ. The *Annales Londonienses* note Scarning's name.² The two new commissioners were doubtless men of more leisure, though less mark, than the original members. Peter de Leicester had held office in the Exchequer and as justice of the Jews. In 1291 he became a baron of the Exchequer, and remained so till his death, in 1303. Thomas de Scarning was a Norfolk man, brother to the bishop of that name, and himself archdeacon of Norwich.

In B, m. 33, an entry records a fine inflicted on Henry de la

¹ On this and the former occasion the commissioners were doubtless in or near Scotland, with the King, who was often in the border district during these years, intent upon the business of the Scottish succession. See, for Edward's constant sojourns in the north between 1290 and 1292, Gough, *Itinerary of Edward I.*, ii., 73-76, 79-85, 93-104. Edward was away from London from April 1292 to April 1293.

² *Chronicles of Edw. I. and Edw. II.*, Rolls Series, i. 97.

Legh for insulting Robert de Hertford, 'who is sitting by command of the King.' This is, however, the only mention of the name.

We can only guess at the reasons for these changes. The probable explanations may be briefly summarised.

1. Vacancies caused by death. Burnell, for instance, died 25 October, 1292.

2. Vacancies caused by the absence of commissioners on the King's business. The extract quoted above concerning the Earl of Lincoln is one instance: and the calendars of patent and close rolls for the years involved teem with references to the employment of all the chief commissioners on similar errands. Burnell in particular was much engaged in the Scottish succession business, and was absent for long periods in the north with Edward.

3. Vacancies caused by preferment. William de Louth was made Bishop of Ely in 1290, and Treasurer in the same year. Both appointments would considerably curtail his leisure.

4. Possibly special legal, or special local, knowledge was desired. Peter de Leicester's previous experience, and Thomas de Scarning's connection with Norfolk, might make their presence desirable. (A very large proportion of the complaints came from Norfolk.)

A special set of auditors for complaints of the city of London, '*ad querelas ministrorum infra civitatem audiendas assignati*,' were appointed (p. 80). This we know from many references in the roll. When Ralph de Honey Lane, for instance, brought a complaint against John le Breton, once Warden of the city of London, there was to be an inquiry in London before William le Latimer and his colleagues. However, 'afterwards, in the Guildhall at London, before the Bishop of Winchester and William le Latimer, came John de Bakewell and the aldermen of London, and said that they had the privilege, for themselves and the community of London city, of not answering on any charge save within the four walls of the aforesaid city. Wherefore they said that they need not answer

except before the auditors appointed to hear complaints within the city.' The point was yielded, for the auditors 'did not wish to prejudice liberties granted to the aforesaid city.'

To complete our mental picture of the court as it sat, we must imagine, besides accusers and accused and judges, a large number of attorneys, who are practically professional pleaders. There is no hard-and-fast rule as yet. One imagines that Roger de Thornton, *e.g.*, appointed Henry de la Legh and Nicholas de Cerne his attorneys, after watching their successful pleading in their own cause. Certain names, however, recur again and again as attorneys.

An interesting feature is the appearance in many cases of an officer 'qui sequitur pro rege.' The Issue and Liberate Rolls are once more useful in supplying details of these persons. Payments are recorded 'in subvencionem expensarum quas fecit circa negocia nostra proseguenda et defendenda,' as follows:

(1) *To William Inge.*

A. Trinity 15 Edw. I. to Trinity 19 Edw. I. ¹	. . .	£20.
B. Michaelmas 19 Edw. I. and Easter 20 Edw. I. ²	. . .	£20.
C. Michaelmas 20 Edw. I. and Easter 21 Edw. I. ³	. . .	£20.

(2) *To Hugh de Lowther.*

A. Easter and Michaelmas, 19 Edw. I. ⁴	. . .	£20.
B. " " 20 Edw. I. ⁵	. . .	£20.
C. Easter 21 Edw. I. ⁶	. . .	£10.

(3) *To Nicholas de Warwick.*

A. Michaelmas 20 Edw. I. to Easter 21 Edw. I. ⁷	. . .	£20.
B. Michaelmas 21 Edw. I. ⁸	. . .	£10.

¹ Liberate Roll, Michaelmas, 19 and 20 Edw. I., No. 59, m. 1.

² Lib. Roll, Easter, 20 Edw. I., No. 61, m. 1.

³ Lib. Roll, Easter, 21 Edw. I., No. 65, m. 2.

⁴ Lib. Roll, Michaelmas, 19 and 20 Edw. I., No. 59, m. 1.

⁵ Lib. Roll, Michaelmas, 20 and 21 Edw. I., No. 63, m. 1.

⁶ Lib. Roll, Easter, 21 Edw. I., No. 65, m. 1.

⁷ Ibid. m. 2.

⁸ Lib. Roll, Michaelmas, 21 and 22 Edw. I., No. 64, m. 1.

One figure remains to be noticed—that of the court crier, ‘clamator.’ For his duties, performed from the quindene of Hilary 17 Edw. I. to the Saturday before Ash Wednesday 19 Edw. I., he received 20s.¹

The Terms of the Commission.

We probably get the exact powers of the commission stated in B, membrane 27d. The Abbot of Lilleshall there says ‘he was not aware that the auditors had cognisance of any plea, save only of *trespasses done by the King’s ministers, while the King was absent from the kingdom.*’² Thus there were two points to be seized by the eager pleaders of ‘*exceptiones*’:

(1) The restriction of time. The offence must have been committed ‘since the King last crossed to Gascony,’ that is since May 1286.³

A case in Roll A illustrating this is worth special notice.⁴ The husband of a certain woman named Margery was hanged, and his goods forfeited. By special grace of the King, however, his goods, to the value of 100s., were granted to Margery, who brought a writ in pursuance to the sheriff of Oxford. The sheriff returned the writ to Roger de Banbury, hundredman. But Roger refused to carry out the King’s command and kept the goods.

Now came the interesting point. Roger made no attempt to

¹ Liberate Rolls, Michaelmas, 18 and 19 Edw. I., No. 55, m. 3. He is described as ‘clamator coram auditoribus nostris querelarum.’ Yet the commissioners were not appointed until the autumn of 1289. Why, then, ‘the quindene of Hilary, 1289’? His salary for acting as crier before other tribunals was probably counted along with what he received for discharging this function for the special commission. Compare also Nicholas de Tickhill’s term of office (*supra*, page xv).

² B. m. 27d.

³ ‘De transgressionibus et querelis coram vobis audiendis et terminandis post ultimam transfretacionem nostram usque adventum nostrum in partibus Anglie et non ultra, secundum formam vobis inde traditam, habetis intrmittere.’ B. m. 19.

⁴ A. m. 35.

deny the charge, but inquired at what date the King granted the privilege. On her naming the date, it was found that it was before the prescribed term and that therefore the court had no cognisance of that time. 'Ideo Rogerus inde sine die et Margeria nihil capiat per predictam querelam.'

(2) The restriction of person—the offenders must be 'ministers of the King.'

What was the exact scope of this phrase? It certainly extended over a very varied assortment of persons, high and low. In Roll A there are five examples of argument on this point, which show the skill of the legal advisers of the accused parties, though they give us little help in arriving at a definition. In the first case, the defendant is a bailiff of the hundred of Lothingland.¹ He pleads that he is seneschal of John Balliol, who holds the hundred of Lothingland of the King. In that hundred, he says, a certain Richard Durrant 'servit in omnibus que ad dominum regem pertinent.' He himself has nothing to do with it. The complainant, however, declares he is nevertheless a minister—'pro eo quod facit execucionem et retornum brevium tam in debitis levandis quam de omnibus aliis que ad dominum regem pertinent.'

In the next case the mayor of Bristol is accused.² He protests, 'quia electus est in maiorem per communitatem ville et eidem communitati prestat sacramentum et non domino regi.'

Another mayor, the mayor of Wallingford, likewise refuses to be called a minister.³ The complainant answers, 'Est juratus domini regis pro eo quod habet retornum brevium libertatis de Walingforde, et in eadem libertate ministrat sicut vicecomes.'⁴

¹ A. m. 22d. Thurtone v. Alevent.

² A. m. 38. Tannour v. Draper.

³ A. m. 22d. Orfevre v. Louthis.

⁴ This is a curiously unwarrantable extension of Edward I.'s anti-feudal policy. It shows a strange twist of mind to declare that, because a man possesses the franchise of return of writs, he is for that very reason minister of and responsible to the King. The *quo warranto* movement had ascertained exactly what franchises existed. Here we have an indication of a possible further step, the assumption

In the fourth case the defendant declares himself seneschal of John de Ryvers.¹ Nevertheless, says his adversary, 'fecit officium hundredarii predictæ libertatis et ita ministrabat domino regi.'

The fifth case is similar—the defendant is 'clericus juratus de hundredo.'²

Thus we are asked to infer various qualifications for the title of minister, according to the special pleading of the complainants. A minister, apparently, must either—

- a. Be appointed by the King.
- b. Take an oath to the King.
- c. Do work affecting the King's interests.

In one aspect, he is any man who is in any degree responsible to the King; in another aspect, he is any man for whose work the King is in any degree responsible. This curious doctrine treated the very officers of the franchises, whose existence was the chief barrier in the way of carrying out Edward I.'s policy, as the ministers of the monarch. If the responsible commissioners had been bold enough to accept a view so unhistorical, yet so conducive to the King's interests, their net could have been cast very widely. In any case, however, the persons against whom the commissioners heard complaints were of very different degrees of importance.³

The two rolls recording the inquiry, though they do not commit the anachronism of striving after precision, make some rough attempt at division of classes. The shorter, B, might be called

that such franchises were not grants from the Crown, but privileges held strictly under its surveillance. There is, however, no evidence in the roll to suggest that this view was officially accepted by the commissioners.

¹ A. m. 22d. Thos. de la More v. John de Olivestede.

² A. m. 31. Robt. de Stafford v. Robt. le Blanch.

³ Cf. Wykes, p. 321. 'Non solum ministri qui regi familiariter adhæserunt, sed et forinseci, ut puta justitiiarii Judeorum, justitiiarii forestæ, forestarii tam feodarii quam temporales, et omnes qui de transgressione venationis convinci poterant, vicecomites et custodes maneriorum, quocumque titulo ballivorum fruebantur.'

‘the roll of the great offenders.’ No less than thirteen justices figure in it, and amongst them the highest in the land. Adam de Stratton appears as the chief example from the Exchequer. The clerks to the justices are set beside their masters. A few sheriffs appear. Thus, in spite of a leaven of smaller men—about eighty bailiffs, a constable or two, and so on—the main interest of B lies about the greatest culprits.

Roll A, longer and more tedious, keeps within the more usual rut of offenders. It has a statistical rather than a dramatic interest. The most important of its defendants are more than forty sheriffs and under-sheriffs, but it includes nine mayors, fifteen coroners, five escheators and sub-escheators, and between three and four hundred bailiffs and sub-bailiffs. Only three justices, and those not of the first rank, appear.

The Great Offenders.

A few words concerning each of the more prominent officials involved may not be out of place, although it would be beyond the scope of the present Introduction to do more than give such information as is essential to the understanding of the two rolls, while indicating sources of more detailed information.¹

Three great representatives of three great courts claim first attention.

*Thomas de Weyland*² had been chief justice of Common Pleas since 1278. He had previously been employed on *itineria*. He was apparently more deeply involved than his colleagues, if one may judge from his hasty flight on the King's return, from his notable disgrace and banishment, and particularly from the

¹ There are useful biographies of most of these judges in Foss, *Judges of England*. His statements, however, are not always decisive. At times statements in the *Judges of England* are contradicted in its abridgment, the *Biographia Juridica*. Brompton's fine, *e.g.*, appears in the former as 3,000, in the latter as 6,000 marks.

² See article in the *Dictionary of National Biography* by Professor T. F. Tout.

permanent character of his punishment. His abjuration of the realm in February 1290 removed him early from the stage. His name occurs twice in Roll B, never in Roll A. (See pp. 49-51, 91-92.)

Ralph de Hengham,¹ chief justice of the King's Bench since 1274, was regarded by mediæval tradition as hardly used. The story ran in the reign of Richard III. that his offence had merely been the erasure of 'marca' and insertion of 'dimidia marca' in the record of a poor man's fine. Yet the enormous sum of 7,000 marks reported as the amount of his fine would seem to imply serious guilt. The receipt rolls record £4,303 6s. 8d. paid in as fines by Hengham between 1290 and 1293—an amount which exceeds by more than £600 the sums received from Brompton, the greatest sufferer, financially, of his colleagues in disgrace. The rolls present him in a not unfavourable light. Appendix III. shows him as defendant in nine cases (of which three are here printed, pp. 27-40, 46-51). In five out of the nine he emerged with flying colours. Possibly the accusations against him were 'rather the consequence than the cause of disgrace.' At any rate, as early as 1300 his name again appeared in the list of judges summoned to Parliament; and in April of that year he was appointed amongst those who were to perambulate the forests. Finally, in September 1301, he was appointed chief justice of Common Pleas. At his death in 1311 he was considered worthy of burial in St. Paul's.

*Adam de Stratton*² had played a prominent part in the Exchequer through the reign of both Henry III. and Edward I. He had already, in 1279, been suspended from office and threatened with disgrace for fraud and forgery; but he had weathered the storm and been reinstated. Once more, however, his evil practices

¹ See article in the *Dictionary of National Biography* by Mr. J. M. Rigg.

² See Mr. Hubert Hall in the preface to the *Red Book of the Exchequer*, vol. iii., pp. cccxv-cccxxx, and article in *Dictionary of National Biography*.

were discovered. Yet by 1291 he had received pardon from the King, in consideration of 500 marks. Cases concerning him are printed on pages 85 and 90.

William de Brompton was the most notable of the remaining delinquents. He had acted as a judge of Common Pleas since 1274, and fines were levied before him from 1278–1289. He was second only to Hengham in the amount of his fine. Foss places it ¹ at 6,000 marks, and the receipt rolls show roughly the same sum, *i.e.* £3,666 13s. 4d. Appendix III. shows him prominent in twenty-eight cases. His subsequent history appears uncertain, though Foss gives instances of the name occurring after 1301.

Solomon de Rochester represents another class of offenders—the itinerant justices. Engaged on the business of Eyres since 1274, he seems to have been exceedingly unpopular. Foss puts his fine at 4,000 marks, rather higher than the sum given on the receipt rolls, *viz.* £2,100. The chroniclers raise a general chorus of complaint against him. His disgrace did not apparently check his misdeeds, for an episode recorded in the ‘*Flores Historiarum*’² tells of Solomon, ‘non ille peritissimus de Biblia, sed de Roffa,’ inciting the itinerant justices against the monks of Rochester in 1292. In 1293 the erring justice was poisoned at his house at Snodland by Wynand, parson of the parish. ‘Ecce mors peccatorum pessima,’ cries the writer of the *Flores*, and records an elaborate apology made by the itinerant justices, ‘sapientia Salomonis nequiter decepti.’ The cases contained in Roll B against Solomon de Rochester, however, rather exculpate than damage him. The evidence upon both sides balances too evenly to make a final verdict on his culpability possible.

William de Saham, for eighteen years a judge of the King’s Bench, is a culprit who seems to deserve lenient judgment. Foss

¹ Foss, *Biographia Juridica*.

² *Flores Hist.* vol. iii., pp. 82 and 83, Rolls Series.

puts his fine at 3,000 marks; the receipt rolls show payment of £1,666 13s. 4d. He was never again put in office, though he survived at any rate till 1300. The present record shows him appearing in seven cases, and his conduct in those cases reveals him as a weak but conscientious man, whose confusion and slowness are taken advantage of by unscrupulous colleagues. In his case with John de Cave (page 40), Saham apparently became hopelessly bewildered, as he was led by the sharp-witted clerk into contradictions and damaging admissions. His final withdrawal was rather pathetic. 'Asked by the . . . auditors whether he wished to pursue his case against John de Cave, he said repeatedly that he did *not* wish to pursue it, against him or anyone else, but wholly withdrew his plaint.'

The remaining justices involved—*Richard de Boyland* and *Thomas de Sodington*, among the itinerant justices; *John de Lovetot* and *Roger de Leicester* from the King's Bench; and *Robert de Littlebury*, clerk of the rolls—need not be dealt with individually. Pardons to Lovetot, Brompton, Hengham and Littlebury may be found dated February 11 and 12 in the patent roll for 1291.¹

There remains one more offender worthy of note—*Henry de Bray*,² once escheator 'this side of Trent,' and justice of the Jews. From 1272–1290, his name figures largely in patent and close rolls. Early entries speak of him as 'King's clerk,' or bailiff of Gwent, and he is concerned largely with Welsh business. For a time, from 1279–1281, he was keeper of Abergavenny Castle. Apparently even then he had begun the ill-practices which were to ruin him, for two entries record the grievances of the men of Abergavenny against him.³ However, he did not lose the King's favour, for by letters patent, dated February 24, 1283, he was

¹ *Cal. Pat. Rolls*, Edw. I., 1281–1292, p. 421. Lovetot's pardon is copied on membrane 5 of Roll B.

² There is no life of Bray in the *Dictionary of National Biography*, and he is therefore dealt with here rather more fully than his colleagues.

³ *Cal. Pat. Rolls*, Edw. I., 1272–1281, pp. 294 and 339.

appointed to his office of escheator. We have no clue to the exact nature of his offences. At any rate, he was not amongst the first set of accused, for as late as May 15, 1290, we find him still holding office. According to Wykes, Bray surpassed all the rest of the King's ministers in insolence and pride.¹ Cotton tells a story which places the disgraced official in a more pathetic light. 'As the King's guards were taking him in a boat by water to the Tower of London, in the anguish of his heart he leapt up in the boat and would have drowned himself in the stream. But his guards would not have it so, and kept him straitly, and brought him to the Tower. There he would have slain himself by dashing head-first against a certain wall.'² It is the only reference we have to the effect of the King's stringent measures upon those disgraced. The would-be suicide seems a creature more of flesh and blood than the names associated merely with records of fines in roll and chronicle.

The Accusations.

Approaching the two rolls with a view of gaining new light on the dramatic episode of the judges' disgrace, it is disappointing to find with what thoroughness they carry out Professor Maitland's dictum, 'It is of the very essence of a series of records that it shall omit nothing because it is dull or commonplace.' After a tedious tracing of the individual case through a multitude of delays and adjournments, there seems in the end strangely little result. The reckless and ferocious villains painted for us by the chroniclers resolve themselves into a shadowy group of petty sinners: their 'enormous transgressions' into rough extortion of money, or tyranny in a remote village on a small scale.

This very removal of the lurid tints in the picture, however, is in itself valuable. The chroniclers had dealt in vague generalities, and had painted with no sparing hand when depicting the iniquities of those in high places. Local interest, such as the Norfolk

¹ Wykes, p. 321.

² Cotton, p. 175-6.

chroniclers had in the trials, since so many complaints came from that district, would enhance the possibility of exaggeration. Bartholomew de Cotton, for instance, obviously gloats over the successive punishments he details,¹ and even regrets that by money fines the culprits succeeded in stemming the King's wrath.

Despite their desire to tell a good story, the chroniclers were not likely in this case to have first-hand information. The King might send them precise copies of documents where the claim to an overlordship was in question:² but he would not supply details of the overthrow of his own instruments. The accounts of the chroniclers, then, are either vague or extravagant. Hemingburgh devotes five lines and a pious quotation to the whole business.³ The *Flores* state that the King's justices and ministers in his absence, 'muneribus excæcati, judicia perverterunt et in aliis erraverunt.'⁴ Wykes is more explicit with regard to individual culprits.⁵ Cotton speaks at some length of the 'enormia facinora et homicidia,' of the 'homicide, sedition and other excesses' of Adam of Stratton, and so forth.⁶ The writer of the *Annals of Dunstable* waxes eloquent indeed.⁷ 'Interim clamor miserorum venit ad eum, quod justiciarii et alii ministri, quos regno suo præfecerat, corrupti muneribus judicia subvertissent: et quod de substantia aliena incliti facti essent: item quod homicidio consensissent et ipsos homicidas scienter receptassent.' 'Vulgariter dicebatur,' he adds later—and it is hard not to feel a quiet satisfaction beneath the words—'omnes declinaverunt simul, inutiles facti sunt, non est qui faciat bonum.'

¹ Cotton, p. 176, 'Alii facti sunt exules, et alii, bonis omnibus denudati ac proscripti, de divitibus facti sunt pauperes, alii facti sunt obprobrium vicinis suis valde et timor notis suis. Et qui videbant eos foras fugerunt: oblivioni dati sunt, nec est qui consoletur eos ex omnibus caris suis.'

² Compare Hemingburgh, ii. 37 (Eng. Hist. Soc.).

³ Hemingburgh, ii. 16 (Eng. Hist. Soc.).

⁴ *Flores Hist.* iii. 70 (Rolls Series).

⁵ Wykes, 319-322 (Rolls Series).

⁶ B. Cotton, 171 (Rolls Series).

⁷ *Annals of Dunstable*, p. 355 (Rolls Series). Also Trivet, p. 16 (Eng. Hist. Soc.).

Only this vague outcry, then, can be gathered from the chroniclers. We turn with confidence to the record for accurate if less dramatic description.

The record, unfortunately, is almost as disappointing as the chroniclers. Even when the two rolls have been collated, and additional information taken from the first and added to the second, there are still lamentable gaps. In no less than 60 out of the 165 cases recorded in the shorter roll, the accusation is never given, or only vaguely given as 'trespass.'

More than that, the terminations of the cases are either lost or not recorded in many instances. We are left, after a stirring narration of the wickedness of a culprit, to decide the case for ourselves. His actual fate remains a mystery.

Statistics, then, must rest on a frail foundation; and even for such imperfect statistics a dilemma at once presents itself. Two courses are open.

A. We may take as a basis of calculation the results of the cases, where known. We may assume, that is to say, that the proportion of convictions represents the proportion of actual crime.

B. We may neglect the actual result of the case, and reason from the accusations, whether proven or not.

Course A, though perhaps the more natural, is open to grave objections. It implies that absolutely impartial justice was meted out: that the offender was always caught and the innocent always acquitted. Now the wideness of the mesh in the net of mediæval justice is proverbial, and such a supposition is a manifest absurdity. Further, in these particular cases there were special reasons for error in the final judgment.

(1) The men accused were trained in legal technicalities, ready to twist and turn, to avail themselves of every loophole of escape. In a 'golden age of forms,'¹ such knowledge would be invaluable. The hunter might easily dig a pit for the hunted and fall into it

¹ Pollock and Maitland, *History of English Law*, ii. 561-563.

himself; or he might select a weapon which proved unsuitable for his particular purpose. Abundant evidence of the value of this specialist knowledge may be found in even a glance through the text.

(2) Where there were records to appeal to, they had been drawn up by the culprits themselves, or their clerks, and might often be quite unreliable. In the case of John son of Roger de Reed,¹ the plaintiff declares that enrolments were not duly made. His story runs as follows. While under age, John handed over a part of his inheritance for a term of years to Richard de Chertsey. But Richard de Chertsey, and John de Chertsey, late clerk to William de Brompton, to assure their position, prepared a 'carta feoffamenti,' and bringing John de Reed to Westminster, 'fecerunt quemdam finem levare absque examinacione justiciariorum et absque brevi et absque summonicione et absque ordine curie.' The alleged illegal fine was challenged on John's behalf: 'but whether the aforesaid challenge was enrolled or not he does not know, for John de Chertsey was at that time a clerk in the Bench.'

(3) The most serious objection of all, however, to drawing inferences from the number of convictions is that to do so does not reckon upon the attitude of the Crown. The King's hand behind the complainants was always insistent and obvious. It was a matter which touched him nearly. At the same time the period was an anxious one financially; the wars with Wales and the subsequent settlement had been expensive; the conflict with Scotland was to prove more so; the French war was gradually brewing; the King was deeply indebted to the Italian societies of bankers, and funds would be now more than ever necessary. It is not surprising, then, that after the first outburst of indignation Edward may have turned his attention rather to the monetary profits to be got from the business than to the demands of abstract justice.

¹ B. m. 3. Case 6, p. 24. Compare *Fleet of Fines*, 15 Edw. I., case 215, file 39, No. 117.

To punish the worst offenders and frighten the rest was imperative; but that once done, his rigour might abate for a money consideration. The disgraced men were no worse, if no better, than the majority of their colleagues; why, then, break a tool which might still have its uses? 'All the justices,' says Bartholomew de Cotton,¹ 'made fines with the King . . . and so, by the intervention of the mammon of unrighteousness, peace was re-established between them and the King.' An examination of the Receipt Rolls of the Exchequer for the period covered by the trials makes the prominence of the financial side of the matter very apparent. The table following this page shows the sums paid by the principal offenders.² The figures at the head represent Receipt Rolls from Easter 1290 to Michaelmas 1293.³

This financial aspect must always be remembered in judging cases from their results.

B. Course B, an analysis of accusations, has dangers also. The period is well known for elaborate accusations. The remarkable ingenuity in piling upon a nucleus of truth a strange medley of hideous crime, illustrated by the trials of the Templars, Philip IV.'s attack on Boniface VIII., the process of Bishop Guichard of Troyes, and the complaints against Bishop Walter Langton in 1301, doubtless was of use in these cases also. Further, the invitation to all and sundry to tell their tale had its temptation for the unscrupulous. It was easy to model fresh tales upon cases already proven. However, an analysis of accusations approximates to the truth more closely than an analysis of results. There is no smoke without a fire; and the nature, if not the number, of the offences may be fairly accurately discerned. Taking as our basis the shorter roll B,

¹ P. 173. Cf. also Wykes, p. 321 (Rolls Series).

² Compare, however, the statement in the schedule printed on p. 39, that Hengham's fine was 8,000 marks and Saham's 2,000 marks. The table shows that the smaller fine was exacted to the uttermost, but that Hengham was never compelled to pay all that he had promised.

³ Receipt Rolls (Pells), Nos. 72, 73, 74, 76, 78, 80, 83, 84 (2 for each year, 18 to 21 Edward I.).

FINES PAID BY THE CHIEF OFFENDERS.

—	1 Easter		2 Michael- mas		3 Easter		4 Michael- mas		5 Easter		6 Michael- mas		7 Easter		8 Michael- mas		Total
	£	s. d.	£	s. d.	£	s. d.	£	s. d.	£	s. d.	£	s. d.	£	s. d.	£	s. d.	
Rich. de Boyland	333	6 8	20	0 0	20	0 0	20	0 0	20	0 0	20	0 0	20	0 0	20	0 0	473 6 8
Henry de Bray	—		200	0 0	66	13 4	—		—		37	13 4	—		—		304 6 8
Will. de Brompton	1,333	6 8	200	0 0	466	13 4	333	6 8	333	6 8	333	6 8	333	6 8	333	6 8	3,666 13 4
R. de Hengham	2,000	0 0	270	0 0	396	13 4	303	6 8	333	6 8	333	6 8	333	6 8	333	6 8	4,303 6 8
R. de Leicester	133	6 8	20	0 0	20	0 0	20	0 0	20	0 0	—		20	0 0	20	0 0	253 6 8
J. de Lovetot	333	6 8	100	0 0	100	0 0	100	0 0	100	0 0	100	0 0	100	0 0	400	0 0	1,333 6 8
R. de Littlebury	66	13 4	204	0 0	66	13 4	—		—		13	6 8	—		13	6 8	364 0 0
S. de Rochester	1,000	0 0	100	0 0	100	0 0	100	0 0	166	13 4	166	13 4	166	13 4	4300	0 0	2,100 0 0
T. de Sodington	373	6 8	116	13 4	60	0 0	116	13 4	100	0 0	133	6 8	133	6 8	93	6 8	1,126 13 4
W. de Saham	—		333	6 8	—		315	0 0	351	13 4	—		—		666	13 4	1,666 13 4

since it deals with the more important culprits, the analysis may be briefly made thus :—

I. Cases where no accusation is stated	58
II. Error, favour, and maintenance	45
III. Violence	47
IV. False enrolments	7
V. Unclassified offences	8
	—
Total	165

I. *No accusation stated*.—The only comment suggested under this head is that the large proportion of such cases is suggestive of the extreme vagueness underlying the whole of the proceedings before the commission.

II. *Error, favour, and maintenance*.—For the heading describing group II. we are indebted to the Abbot of Roche, who refers thus to the conduct of those who ‘abjudged’ land from his predecessor. ‘So by error and favour and maintenance,’ he concludes, ‘was this injury done to the house of Roche.’ The class of offence is more or less peculiar, pertaining specially to an inquiry where the culprits are officials banded against the outsider. In all sorts of ways, the complainants declare, offenders have been screened and protesting voices silenced. Four classes may be selected as typical.

1. Refusal to allow ‘exceptiones’ or special pleas. No doubt such ‘exceptiones’ had become far too frequent; and had they been always allowed, cases would have been fought out on bewildering side issues instead of on the actual charge. At the same time, to refuse to hear them was an effectual method of stopping undesirable proceedings, and a biassed judge might use this power for his own ends. In the same category comes the arbitrary choice of jurors, and neglect of the plaintiffs’ challenges. Henry de la Legh and Nicholas de Cerne, for instance, complain that a packed jury, tenants of Ralph de Beauchamp, their enemy, was

called.¹ John de Ronhale declares that by the removal of three men and the substitution of three others he lost a case.² Instances might be multiplied.

2. A more serious offence was actual intimidation. The case of William de Durnford³ is an interesting and, as the jurors on their oath confirmed William's story, a trustworthy example. Robert le Red complained of William before Richard de Boyland on *iter* in Gloucester. William's answers were not admitted, in the first place, and the case was decided in Robert's favour. A more dramatic piece of injustice, however, followed. In the great hall at Bristol where pleas of the crown were held, Richard de Boyland bade his marshal John de Wykham, 'who carried the rod before him in the *iter*,' seize William. John did so, and carried him off to 'a certain square green, shut in with a high stone wall, close to the hall.' There he remained the best part of the day. Meanwhile his friends had been pleading for him. 'But Richard, then sitting on the bench, spoke to them, and threatened that he would hang William that very day before he supped,' unless he would make a fine with the Earl of Gloucester. William judged pliancy to be the safest course, and paid over two hundred marks. The story is an interesting commentary on the value of frequent *itineras*.

3. Many irregularities occurred in the actual pleadings. Take for example the case of William de Bardwell *v.* Ralph de Hengham.⁴ William brought a writ of trespass against the abbot of Bury St. Edmunds, before Ralph and his colleagues. But Ralph, 'eo pre-textu quod certum feodum de camera dicti abbatis perceperat,' supported the abbot. He led William's *narratores* on to plead beyond the form of the writ, and would not hear them till they did so. Worse still, John de Lovetot and Richard de Boyland, justices of the King, came with the abbot and gave him help and advice,

¹ B. m. 16. Case 8, pp. 27-40.

² B. m. 25d. Case 2, pp. 5-11.

³ B. m. 38.

⁴ B. m. 6. Case 10, pp. 49-51.

both secretly and openly. Thomas de Weyland, too, aided the abbot. A more flagrant case of favour and 'maintenance' can hardly be imagined. As usual, we possess no final entry in the case, and are left in ignorance as to the sequel of the revelation.

4. A variety of miscellaneous annoyances were directed against those not in favour with the justices. Inquests were taken in wrong counties, and by unsuitable persons.¹ Judgment was delayed for bribes.² Juries were forced to condemn innocent persons or to change their verdict.³ Writs were not executed, losses not levied, arrests not made. Whether through malice, or through the universal carelessness and procrastination so characteristic of mediæval justice, infinite annoyance and delay were caused.⁴

III. *Violence*—to use a general term to include various forms of oppression and abuse—is an offence of a nature less specially characteristic of the present proceedings than the offences last dealt with. The offenders in the last instance were men of some eminence, or their maintenance would have been of little use. Violence, however, was the weapon of the less exalted offender, the bailiff with a grudge against a fellow-townsmen, the sheriff greedy to line his nest softly in the absence of his master, and so forth. The usual form it took was the imprisonment of a man to extort money, or the seizure of his goods for the same reason. Nearly 30 per cent. of the cases in B represent this tyranny of the small official. Perhaps here more than elsewhere there is danger of a trumped-up charge. No great invention was needed to describe ill-treatment; it was easy to suppress mention of any provocation to the assault. One feels a trifle distrustful, for instance, of Thomas Silvester's loud outcry against Roger de Lincoln, constable of Exeter Castle.⁵ The tale reads like a melodrama rather than a truthful account.

¹ Cf. Thos. de Goldington v. Nich. de Stapleton, B. m. 17 and 17d. Case 18, pp. 81-84.

² Cf. Guy de Stanham v. Will. de Saham, B. m. 29d.

³ Cf. Henry, son of Nicholas, v. S. de Rochester, B. m. 30d. Case 14, pp. 67-70.

⁴ Cf. B. m. 10, 10d, 6d, etc.

⁵ B. m. 39d. Case 11, pp. 51-53.

Silvester, meeting the constable in Exeter one day, is taken to the castle. Once there, the gates are closed behind him, and he is beaten by 'six unknown rascals,' and dragged by his feet to prison. He is loaded with fetters and cast head foremost into a dungeon fifteen feet deep. There, wounded by the fall, he lies starving from Monday to Wednesday, till from agony he is delirious and like to die. Meanwhile his beasts have been seized and sold. Against these picturesque details the defence of the constable rings true. He admits the imprisonment, but declares that it was a just detention till Thomas paid money due as bailiff of the King. Both parties put themselves on the country, but we have no record of the decision.

IV. *False Enrolments*.—It is not surprising that the proportion of false enrolments is small. To break the King's seal, destroy the King's documents, and insert new matter in old texts, required a different order of courage from that which directed petty oppressions. Both the risk and the labour were great. It is William de Brompton, one of the most daring of the offenders, who sins the most noticeably in this respect. Robert de Botydone¹ tells how, wishing to get rid of an *essoin* in a certain case, William 'caused the whole roll in which the *essoin* was entered to be altered, and altogether removed the *essoin*.' When Robert protested, he was sent to prison. This accusation was not proved against William de Brompton, for Robert refused to certify the court by the clerks and attorneys concerned, though he was willing to submit to a '*patria*' of Northampton. One feels that, had he consented, the risk of losing his case would have been very great.²

Summarising the results of this analysis, one must conclude that the record does on the whole bear out the wail of the chroniclers. The culprits were not the thorough-paced scoundrels that the chroniclers would have us think them, nor were the complainants as completely innocent and injured as they represent

¹ B. m. 33d.

² Cf. also B. m. 5d, 11, 29, 30, 36d.

themselves. Nevertheless enough of truth is mingled in the cup of discontent to show that a very real oppression had lain upon the country during the King's absence.

The Plan of the Edition.

The book consists of two parts—selected cases and three appendices. We are aware of the objections that can be urged against any plan of excerpts from records, such as that we have adopted; but we can plead the example of the accomplished editors of the publications of the Selden Society, and we are convinced that there is no other practical way of making accessible the essential portions of records so long and so formal as are the bulk of our plea rolls. It was indeed originally intended to print B, the shorter roll, in full, adding, where relevant, extracts from A. However, such a plan had at least three disadvantages.

1. Even the short roll would have formed a bulky volume, with little room for illustrative or critical matter.

2. Many entries, relating to adjournments or appointments of attorneys, are purely formal, tending to obscure more valuable matter for the historian, and to weary the general reader; and others refer to cases whose general interest and importance are singularly small.

3. The most serious objection to the mere straightforward printing, however, was that it would have transferred a considerable amount of labour from the shoulders of the editors to those of the reader who wished to consult the document for a special purpose. Suppose, for example, that information was required concerning William de Brompton. The index would show fifty-four entries containing his name; and it would only be after lengthy sifting and comparison that the reader would discover that twenty-eight different cases were involved in these, and that only some twenty of the total entries contained any real information.

It was decided, therefore, to undertake a thorough examination

of the matter in both rolls, and present it in a form for ready reference. The result is Appendices II. and III., dealing with rolls A and B respectively, bringing together cases concerning individuals, and entries relating to the same case, in alphabetical order. Five points should be noted to facilitate the use of the appendices.

1. Appendix II. analyses Roll A, Appendix III. Roll B. Justices should be sought chiefly in the latter, sheriffs chiefly in the former.

2. In Appendix II. a dagger (†) against a name in the first column shows that the name recurs, and must be sought, in Appendix III. This does not necessarily imply that the same case recurs.

3. If the offender thus referred to is concerned in the same case in both rolls, the references to both rolls appear in Appendix III., differentiated in type.

4. The most important reference is asterisked (*) in each case. Such an asterisk usually implies that the accusation is set forth, or the result of the case stated, in the entry thus marked. In some cases all entries are purely formal.

5. Personal names are printed as they stand, with alternative spellings in a footnote. In the column headed 'Office,' however, names of towns, hundreds, and churches have been identified and printed in their modern form.

An example will show how rapid this system renders the work of reference. Material relating to William de Brimbleschote is required, we will suppose. A glance at Appendix II. shows us that he was sheriff of Hampshire, and was involved in five different cases. Further, we see that in only two of these cases is the accusation stated, whereas all the results plainly appear. The asterisked references show where more detailed information may be sought in the original. The dagger before the name warns us that the delinquent is referred to also in Roll B. Turning to Appendix III., we find various further references to one of the cases, but are shown by the absence of asterisks that no real

additional information is contained there. Thus, being in possession of the description of the accused, the names of his accusers, the nature of his offence, the county whence the complaints came, and with references which discriminate between valuable and valueless entries, it is possible to see at once whether further investigation would be profitable. For this reason we feel that the large omissions which have been made in editing the rolls are justifiable. One principle has been followed in choosing the extracts which have been printed, viz. to include at least one example of accusations against each of the greatest offenders. Only so much of each case is set down as is absolutely necessary for its comprehension. The references at the head of each extract show where the rest of the formal stages in the case are to be found.

One task has been shirked in this analysis—the pronouncing of an ultimatum as to chronology. It was felt that the advantage to be derived from a table showing the dates in the progress of each case was trivial compared with the very great risk of inaccuracy. The disorderly arrangement of the roll, the very casual dating,¹ the numerous entries in every case, made the task almost impossible save for a legal expert; while, even for such a one, conjecture would at times be necessary to supplement knowledge. For the historical student the broad dates of the proceedings suffice, while to the searcher after particular problems the determination of particular dates may be safely left.

¹ Compare, for instance, Hengham's extraordinary statement (printed on p. 35). According to him, '*breuia nunquam facta erant quousque capta esset inquisicio, set si clerici ignorabant de ponendo rectam datam, propter hoc non fuerunt breuia vitiosa; quia in cancellaria et alibi in uno et eodem die unus clericus ponat unam datam et alius aliam.*'

APPENDIX TO THE INTRODUCTION.

ADDITIONAL CASES.

SINCE going to press a loose slip of parchment has been discovered in the Public Record Office and identified as a membrane of Roll 541 B. The entries it contains may be summarised as follows :

1. An adjournment in the case of *Legh & Cerne v. Brompton* (pp. 27-40).
2. A fresh case, *Geoffrey de Aqua v. Brompton*. Geoffrey brought four assizes of novel disseisin against Roger Bigod, Earl of Norfolk, and others, before Brompton, in Norfolk, in the year 16 Edward I. Brompton exerted undue influence to get Geoffrey's claim rejected, and caused twelve strangers to swear Geoffrey was a villein. The auditors now examined the record, found its proof insufficient, and decided that Geoffrey was entitled to a remedy, notwithstanding the previous judgment.
3. An adjournment in the case of *Katharine de la Ryole v. William le Forester* (App. III. case 81).
4. An adjournment in the case of *John de Newenham v. Thomas de Staunford*, subescheator of Middlesex.
5. A fresh case, *Roger Doget and Margery his wife v. William de Saham and his colleagues in the county of Essex*. In an assize of novel disseisin brought by John, son of Robert de la Legh, against Roger and Margery at Lewes, Saham, 'voluntarily and without reasonable cause and to their great loss and injury,' adjourned the assize to Chichester. The auditors examined the record, and, finding it unsatisfactory, decided that John de Cobham, Simon de Winchester, and John Peche should summon the parties afresh before them and deal with the case.¹

¹ It should be noted that the discovery of this extra membrane affects the numeration on pages xiv, xxxi, xxxii, xxxv, xxxix. The membrane is undated.

SELECT CASES FROM ROLL 541B.

1

Defendants.—All the Justices of the Bench, 13 & 14 Edward I., and especially William de Brompton..

Complainant.—The Abbot of Roche.

Reference to manuscript.—B., Membrane 18, 18d.

No other references.

Number of case in Appendix III., 41.

Abbas de Rupe ¹ queritur de iusticiariis de Banco qui fuerunt Linc.
anno regni regis nunc terciodecimo et quartodecimo, et precipue
de Willelmo de Bromptone, quod cum quidam Iohannes Paynel
per manutenementum Iohannis de Kyrkebi tunc episcopi Elyensis,
cuius neptem predictus Iohannes duxerat in uxorem, quoddam
breue portasset versus Walterum Abbatem de Rupe, predeces-
sorem Abbatis nunc, quod vocatur *precipe in capite*, de vno
mesuagio et triginta duabus bouatis terre cum pertinenciis in
Roxebi ² in comitatu Lincolnie, quod quidem breue retornatum
fuit in Banco in octabis sancti Iohannis Baptiste anno regni regis
nunc terciodecimo: Ad quem diem predictus Abbas fuit essoniatus
et habuit diem a die sancti Michaelis in xv. dies: Ad quem diem
petiit visum predictorum tenementorum et habuit diem a die
sancti Martini in xv. dies: Ad quem diem Abbas fuit essoniatus
et habuit diem a die sancti Hillarii in xv. dies: Ad quem diem
partes placitauerunt ita quod infra dimidium annum contra legem
et consuetudinem regni quatuor dies dati fuerunt predicto Abbati,
vbi in vno anno tres dies vel in duobus annis quinque dies ad plus

¹ Roche, Cistercian abbey, near Rotherham, in South Yorkshire.

² Roxby.

debent dari in breui de recto : ad dampnum predicti Abbatis etc. : Et vnde petit quod isti fauor et error corrigantur secundum statutum Marlebergie¹ in penultimo capitulo etc. Preterea idem Abbas queritur quod cum predicti iusticiarii a die sancti Hillarii in xv dies dedissent diem prefato Abbati vsque in crastino Assensionis Domini anno regni regis nunc xiiij^o, predictus Walterus predecessor predicti Abbatis die Martis proxima ante dictum festum moriebatur apud Bellum Locum Regis² in comitatu Suthamtonie : Ad quem diem monachi de Rupe coram iusticiariis dixerunt quod Abbas predictus mortuus fuit, quod testificatum fuit per probos et legales homines et per litteras Abbatum de Bello Loco et de Norteleye,³ qui ipsum sepelierunt die Martis predicto : set predicti iusticiarii istam calumpniam non admiserunt nec irrotulauerunt, contra statutum domini Regis vltimo apud Westmonasterium editum,⁴ set per errorem et fauorem adiudicauerunt quamdam defaultam versus predictum Abbatem mortuum post apparenciam : Et fecerunt exire breue quod vocatur *paruum cape* ad capiendum predicta tenementa in manus domini Regis, et ad summoniendum predictum Abbatem quod esset coram eis in octabis sancti Iohannis Baptiste ad audiendum iudicium suum de predicta defaulta facta post apparenciam : Ad quem diem monachi de Rupe simul cum quibusdam monachis de Bello Loco venerunt coram iusticiariis et dixerunt quod nullam defaultam potuit facere eo quod predictus Abbas mortuus fuit, quod parati fuerunt verificare. Predicti iusticiarii hoc non obstante adiudicauerunt seisinam predictorum tenementorum predicto Iohanni, nulla inquisicione prehabita, et quod predictus Abbas esset in misericordia. Et sic per errorem et fauorem et manutenementum predictum istam iniuriam fecerunt predicti iusticiarii predicte domui de Rupe, Abbate eorum defuncto, ad dampnum ipsius domus mille librarum etc.

¹ Stat. Marlborough, 1267, cap. 28, *Statutes of the Realm*, I., p. 19. Provisum est etiam quod si depredaciones vel rapine alique fiant abbatibus vel aliis prelatiis ecclesiasticis, et ipsi ius suum de huiusmodi depredacionibus prosequentes morte preveniantur antequam inde iusticiam fuerint assecuti, successores eorum acciones habeant ad bona ecclesie sue de manibus huiusmodi transgressorum repetenda.

² Beaulieu, Cistercian abbey in the New Forest.

³ Netley, Cistercian abbey on Southampton Water.

⁴ Stat. Westminster II., 1285, cap. 31, *Statutes of the Realm*, I., p. 86. Cum aliquis implacitatus coram aliquibus iusticiariis proponat excepcionem et petat quod Iusticiarii eam allocent, quam si allocare noluerint si ille qui excepcionem proponet scribat illam excepcionem et petat quod iusticiarii apponant sigilla in testimonium. Et si unus apponere noluerit, apponat alius de societate, etc.

Et Willelmus de Bromptone venit et dicit quod loquela inter ipsum Abbatem et Iohannem Paynel fuit coram ipso et sociis suis in Banco, et ibidem redditum fuit iudicium coram eis secundum legem et consuetudinem Anglie. Et postea per breue domini Regis miserunt recordum et processum loquele predicte coram R. de Hengham et sociis suis placita Regis tenentibus. Et dicit quod ibidem confirmatum fuit iudicium predictum tanquam bonum secundum legem et consuetudinem Anglie, vnde videtur ei quod sine predicto Radulfo et sociis suis, qui predictum iudicium confirmauerunt pro bono, non debet hic respondere. Et dicit quod si auditores velint quod sine ipsis respondeat vltierus respondebit etc. Et predictus Willelmus, requisitus si dedisset predicto Abbati quatuor dies in predicto placito infra dimidium annum, cum Abbas dicat quod non pertineat ad iusticiarios de Banco dare nisi tres dies tantum per annum vel quinque dies infra duos annos in placito brevis de recto, dicit quod iusticiarii de Banco hucusque usi sunt pro voluntate sua dare partibus plures dies per annum quam tres secundum propinquitatem comitatus ante duellum vadiatum vel misam magne assise. Et quoad testificacionem de morte Walteri Abbatis predecessoris Abbatis nunc, dicit quod nichil fecit contra legem et consuetudinem regni: quia dicit quod huiusmodi testificacio per litteras episcoporum seu abbatum non est admittenda tanquam autentica in curia domini Regis nisi in casibus specialibus, scilicet vbi episcopus scribit iusticiariis de Banco quod aliquis excommunicatus sit propter suam contumaciam vel absolutus si prius excommunicatus fuerit et in consimilibus etc. Et preterea dicit quod inquisicio capta fuit per preceptum Regis de morte vel vita ipsius Abbatis, per quam inquisitionem conpertum fuit quod predictus Abbas fuit in vita die quo predictum iudicium redditum fuit in Banco etc.

Et Abbas dicit quod licet iudicium illud quod redditum fuit in Banco per Radulfum de Hengham postea confirmatum fuerit pro bono non tamen propter hoc dicit quod illud iudicium est bonum, quia dicit quod sic illa iniuria quam predictus Willelmus fecit predicto Abbati in predicta loquela per predictum Radulfum est augmentata et non correcta etc.

Et Willelmus dicit et petit quod si aliquis error in predicto processu inueniatur, visis loquele predicte recordo et processu, per auditores corrigatur. Et quia videtur auditoribus quod expedit quod predicti recordum et processus videantur et examinentur,

mandatum est Gilberto de Thorntone quod mittat ¹ recordum hic a die sancti Hillarii in xv dies sub sigillo suo etc. Et preceptum est vicecomiti Lincolnie quod scire faciat ¹ Philippo Paynel tenenti tenementa predicta quod sit ad prefatum terminum auditurus recordum predictum etc. Idem dies datus est predictis Abbati et Willelmo in curia etc. Ad quem diem predictus Gilbertus misit recordum et processum loquele predictæ in hec verba:—
‘Placita coram locum Regis tenentibus in crustino Purificacionis beate Marie anno regni Regis Edwardi filii Regis Henrici quinto-decimo, etc.’

This record,
occupying a
membrane
and a half,
not printed.

Linç.
m. 18d.

Postea in octabis sancti Iohannis Baptiste anno regni Regis nunc xix^o venit pre[dictus Abbas] coram auditoribus: Et similiter Philippus Paynel et Robertus de Rowelle qui tenent predicta tenementa. . . . Et predictus Abbas precise petit quod recordum predictum examinetur et quod auditores errorem si qui[libet est in] eodem reuocent et emendent. Et quia, inspectis recordo et processu predictis habitis coram Thoma de Weylaunde et sociis suis, compertum est quod quedam inquisicio ad sectam ipsius Abbatis retornata fuit in Banco apud Westmonasterium coram prefatis iusticiariis, per quam conuictum fuit quod predictus Abbas, quem monachi de Rupe asserebant mortuum fuisse die Martis proxima ante Assencionem Domini anno regni Regis nunc xiiij^o apud Bellum Locum in comitatu Suthamtonie, vivus fuit ibidem a die sancti Iohannis Baptiste in tres septimanas eodem anno, transiens aquam de Hamle: ² Et eciam quia recordum predictum ad sectam eiusdem Abbatis postea positum fuit coram Rege, vbi Iohannes Paynel melius probavit vitam Abbatis quam ipse Abbas qui nunc est mortem predecessoris sui, eo quod predictus Iohannes probavit per viros religiosos, milites, et per seruientes fidedignos et ipse Abbas per monachos et familiares suos qui non ita bene deposuerunt sicut [i]lli quos predictus Iohannes produxit: per quod curia Regis satis certificata est quod predictus Abbas, predecessor Abbatis nunc, [vivus] fuit tempore quo seisinā tenementorum predictorum adiudicata fuit predicto Johanni per defaultam ipsius

¹ Mittant and faciant in MS.

² Hamble, river and creek, a long arm of Southampton Water.

Abbatis : Et eciam quia [iudicium] predictum quod redditum fuit coram prefatis iusticiariis de Banco postea confirmatum fuit coram locum Regis [tenentibus] et per totum consilium domini Regis : Et eciam quia partes que modo sunt hic in iudicio non sunt eedem [que fuerunt cum] iudicium predictum transiit : Consideratum est quod predicti Willelmus, Philippus et Robertus eant inde sine die, et quod [predictus Abbas] nichil capiat hic per querelam suam set sit in misericordia pro falsa querela. Et sibi perquirat per breue . . . si sibi viderit expedire etc.

2

Defendant.—Richard de Boyland, Justice.

Complainant.—William de Durnford.

Reference to manuscript.—B., Membrane 25d.

Other references.—B, Membranes 1d, 2, 3, 4, 5d, 7, 24, 26, 33d.

Number of case in Appendix III., 17.

*Placita coram auditoribus querelarum apud Westmonasterium
a die sancti Hillarii in xv dies anno regni Regis Edwardi viæ°.*

Willelmus de Derneforde¹ queritur de Ricardo de Boylonde nuper iusticiario domini Regis ad placita corone in itinere Gloucestrie de eo quod idem Ricardus grauauit iniuste predictum Willelmum in multis coram ipso in predicto itinere. Primo vbi quidam Robertus le Rede per bilettum questus fuit de predicto Willelmo coram predicto Ricardo in predicto itinere de eo quod predictus Willelmus imprisonasse debuisset quemdam seruientem predicti Roberti et in prisiona detinuisse per octo dies et postmodo propria voluntate ipsum deliberasse et iterum de eo quod idem Willelmus retenuit vnum iumentum predicti Roberti precii decem solidorum : Ibi venit predictus Ricardus de Boylonde et attachiari fecit predictum Willelmum per marescallos suos in predicto itinere ad respondendum predicto Roberto super predicta querela ; et cum idem Willelmus coram eodem Ricardo dixit quod predictæ querele de imprisonmento respondere non teneretur sine brevi, nisi factum fuisset infra summonicionem itineris, illam responsionem sibi

Glouc.
m. 25d.

¹ Durnford, Wilts.

allocare noluit, set fecit ipsum Willelmum vltcrius respondere. Qui quidem Willelmus dixit quod nuncquam predictum seruientem imprisonauit nec imprisonare fecit, et hoc optulit verificare per patriam: et quoad detencionem iumentum dixit idem Willelmus quod iuste captum fuit et ad querelam cuiusdem Iohannis le Hert pro transgressione facta per seruientem predicti Roberti infra libertatem predicti Willelmi de Derhist,¹ pro qua transgressione hutesium fuit leuatum, et per predictum seruientem fuit sanguis in predictam libertatem expansus: vnde ad sectam predicti Iohannis fuit predictus seruientis attachiatus per predictum iumentum pro predicta transgressione quousque voluit se iustificare ad respondendum predicto Iohanni: Et quod non alio modo cepit petiit similiter quod inquireretur. Predictus Ricardus predictas responsiones sibi allocare noluit, nec ipsum admittere ad ipsas responsiones vt eas exposuit verificandas, set statim iudicauit quod predictus Robertus recuperaret dampna sua de decem libris versus predictum Willelmum et comisit predictum Willelmum ad prisonam. Preterea idem Ricardus postea fecit venire predictum Willelmum extra prisonam coram ipso in eodem itinere et in plena curia precepit ei quod pacem faceret cum comite Gloucestrie:² quod si non fecerit suspenderetur per collum antequam manducaret: et iterum retornauit ad prisonam predictum Willelmum et ibi detentus erat in prisa donec finem fecit cum predicto comite per cc. marcas, et quem finem fecit per hoc quod predictus Ricardus vitam duram per prisonam duxit et ob timorem mortis: predicta grauamina fecit sibi predictus Ricardus ad dampnum ipsius Willelmi mille librarum.

Et Ricardus venit et dicit quod non debet respondere sine sociis suis qui fuerunt secum in vltimo itinere illo. Et predictus Willelmus dicit se tamen respondere debet eo quod querela illa facta fuit de ipso Willelmo per billam et non per breue, vnde dicit quod fuit factum suum proprium et non sociorum suorum. Et dicit quod predictus Ricardus solus sedebat nec permisit ipsum abire quousque finem fecisset et illum finem recognovisset coram eo et in rotulis suis. Et predictus Willelmus, requisitus quis eum cepit ad preceptum predicti Ricardi, dicit quod quidem Iohannes de Wychem, tunc vallettus predicti Ricardi portans virgam coram eo in

¹ Deerhurst.

² For Will. de Durnford's previous life and dealings with the Earl of Gloucester, see *Cal. Pat. Rolls*, 1272-1281, p. 346: *ibid.*, 1281-1292, pp. 142, 206, 275, 399: *ibid.*, 1292-1301, pp. 113, 115, 148.

predicto itinere, cepit eum et duxit ipsum in quodam herbario iuxta aulam vbi sedebat, quod quidem herbarium bene fuit circumdatum quatuor muris, et ibi ipsum detinuit quousque predictus Ricardus precepit ipsum duci coram eo et alias reduci in eodem herbario per binam vicem, quousque comes Gloucestrie venit ibi in eodem herbario et ibi fecit finem cum eodem comite. Et predictus Iohannes inuentus in curia dicit quod nuncquam ipsum Willelmum per preceptum predicti Ricardi cepit nec in prisa habuit nec in custodia, et hoc petit quod inquiratur. Et predictus Willelmus similiter. Ideo preceptum est vicecomiti quod venire faciat hic a die Pasche in vnum mensem nisi iusticiarii prius venerint etc. tot et tales de visneto de Bristollia per quos etc. et qui nec etc. ad certificandum etc. Quia tam etc. Postea venit predictus Ricardus et dicit quod rite processit in querela predicti Roberti le Rous et quod nichil aliud fecit nisi secundum legem et consuetudinem regni, vnde vocavit recordum rotulorum suorum, qui visi sunt incontinenter et compertum est recordum bonum. Ideo predictus Ricardus inde sine die quoad predictum Robertum, et Willelmus in misericordia: condonatur per W[illelmum] le¹ Latimer. Set si compertum fuerit quod predictus Willelmus imprisonatus fuit tunc modo debet predictus Ricardus vltius etc. ad querelam ipsius Willelmi. Postea a die Pasche in tres septimanas venit predictus Willelmus, et iuratores similiter, et Iohannes de Wykham non venit et habuit diem hic ad hunc diem. Ideo capiatur inquisicio per eius defaltam. Iuratores dicunt super sacramentum suum quod in itinere Gloucestrie coram Ricardo de Boylonde idem Ricardus precepit Iohanni de Wykham marescallo suo in eodem itinere quod custodiret Willelmum de Derneforde, et quod predictus Iohannes postea cepit ipsum Willelmum et ratione illius precepti eum duxit vsque in quoddam herbarium: Et quod idem Iohannes detinuit ipsum ibi per spacium vnus leucate vie, et postea venerunt Gilbertus de Thorntone et Nicholaus de Apperley ad ipsum ibi et ipse cum eis exiuit etc. Et quia conuictum per predictam inquisitionem in quam predicti Willelmus et Iohannes se posuerunt quod predictus Iohannes ipsum Willelmum per preceptum predicti Ricardi detinuit in prisa, ideo preceptum est vicecomiti Norfolcie et Suffolcie quod capiat predictum Iohannem etc. Ita quod habeat corpus eius hic in octabis sancte Trinitatis ad audiendum recordum et iudicium suum etc. Et Ricardus de Boy-

¹ MS. de.

londe respondit de precepto. Et Ricardus dicit quod predictum Willelmum nunquam inprisonari precepit, nec per ipsum fuit idem Willelmus inprisonatus, nec aliquam recognicionem de ducentis marcis per ipsum Ricardum comiti Gloucestrie fecit. Et hoc petit quod inquiratur. Et predictus Willelmus similiter. Ideo preceptum est vicecomiti quod venire faciat hic in octabis sancte Trinitatis xxiiij tam milites quam etc. tam de villa Bristollie quam de visneto Bristollie, et qui nec etc. ad certificandum etc., Quia tam etc. Ad quem diem Willelmus de Derneforde et Ricardus de Boylonde venerunt et iuratores similiter. Et super hoc venit predictus Ricardus et tulit breue domini Regis in hec verba :

· Rex dilecto et fideli suo Petro de Leycestria salutem. Quia quibusdam certis de causis certiorari volumus super recordo et processu loquele que est coram vobis et sociis vestris auditoribus nostris querelarum inter Willelmum de Derneforde et Ricardum de Boylonde de quadam transgressione eidem Willelmo per prefatum Ricardum illata vt dicitur, vobis mandamus quod recordum et processum loquele predicte cum omnibus ea tangentibus nobis sub sigillo vestro distincte et aperte mittatis. Ita quod ea habeamus coram nobis a die sancti Michaelis in xv. dies vbicumque tunc fuerimus in Anglia et hoc breue, partibus predictis eundem diem prefigentes. Teste me ipso apud Culeforde¹ vj^{to} die Maii anno regni nostri vicesimo.’

Auctoritate cuius brevis auditores supersederunt et prefixerunt partibus diem coram Rege secundum tenorem brevis predicti. Et Willelmus de Derneforde ponit loco suo Rogerum Brun in loquela predicta.

Postea decimo die Nouembris anno regni Regis nunc vicesimo misit Gilbertus de Thornetone tenens locum domini Regis breue suum apud Westmonasterium in hec verba—et recordum quod ei missum fuit :

‘ Sociis et amicis suis karissimis dominis Petro de Leycestria et sociis auditoribus querelarum suis² G. de Thornetone salutem et dileccionem sinceram. Cum Willelmus de Derneforde nuper coram vobis implacitasset Ricardum de Boilonde de quibusdam transgressionibus eidem Willelmo factis ac iudicium in predicta loquela nondum redditum est prout inuenitur in recordo vestro, quod quidem recordum coram domino Rege misistis per breue ipsius

¹ Culford, Suffolk, near Bury St. Edmunds.

² MS. suus.

domini Regis : Et quia mandatum est et in curia domini Regis non vsitatum quod recorda placitorum coram aliquibus iusticiariis inceptorum coram domino Rege mittantur antequam iudicium inde redditum fuerit : vobis predictum recordum sub sigillo meo mitto et vos inde quod vestrum est faciatis in hac parte. Valet.

Ideo preceptum est vicecomiti Norffolcie et Suffolcie quod venire faciat predictum Ricardum hic in octabis sancti Hillarii ad audiendum iuratum predictam : Et preceptum est vicecomiti Gloucestrie quod venire faciat hic ad eundem diem Robertum Warre et socios suos iuratores inquisitionis predicte ad faciendum iuratum illam : Ita quod loquela illa sit in eodem statu in quo fuit in octabis sancte Trinitatis anno regni Regis nunc vicesimo quando atterminata fuit coram Rege per breue ipsius Regis sine iudicio inde reddito. Ad quem diem vicecomes Gloucestrie retornauit panellum set iuratores non venerunt. Et Willelmus venit. Et vicecomes Norffolcie et Suffolcie nichil inde fecit set mandauit quod Ricardus de Boilonde non fuit in patria postquam breue sibi venit per quod ipsum Ricardum veniendi ad diem in breui conten[tum per manuceptionem] rationabiliter ponere non potuit. Et testatum est quod bene potuit ipsum per manuceptionem posuisse et [ideo in . . . misericordi]a. Et preceptum est ei sicut alias [quod venire] faciat predictum Ricardum hic a die Pasche in xv [dies ad faciendam] iuratum predictam. Ita quod loquela illa [etc. Et preceptum est] vicecomiti Gloucestrie quod venire faciat hic ad eundem diem [Robertum Warre etc.] : Et quod habeat hic tot et tales [per quos etc. ita quod] loquela non remaneat, etc. Ad quem diem predictus W[illelmus venit et iuratores] similiter. Et Ricardus non venit. [Et vicecomes mandauit quod] predictus Ricardus manucaptus est per Walterum Kynelyn, Robertum Pyngin, Henricum Kyppe de Meryngch. . . . de eadem. Ideo ipsi in misericordia. Et inquisicio capiatur etc. Iuratores dicunt super sacramentum suum quod predictus Iohannes [de Wykham] marescallus predicti Ricardi cepit et arrestauit predictum Willelmum in magna aula Bristollie vbi placita corone placitabantur per preceptum ipsius Ricardi ad querelam et sectam cuiusdam Roberti le Rede, hominis comitis Gloucestrie, qui de ipso Willelmo querebatur, prout liquere potest per inspeccionem rotulorum predicti itineris (quorum transcriptum huic rotulo est attachiatum), et postea ipsum duxit in quamdam placeam viridem quadratam et alto muro lapideo inclusam iuxta aulam predictam,

Hole in membrane.

et ipsum ibidem detinuit per magnum spacium illius diei quousque G. de Thornetone, tunc seruiens domini Regis in eodem itinere, et Nicholaus de Apperley, tunc senescallus ipsius comitis, et alii amici speciales ipsius Willelmi (quibus vero amicis predictus Ricardus tunc iusticiarius sedens in banco oretenus dicebat minando quod ipsum Willelmus die illo antequam comederet suspendi faceret nisi se aptaret comiti predicto) ad ipsum venerunt in predicta placea et ipsum reduxerunt in aulam predictam, per quorum auxilium finem fecit cum predicto comite per cc. marcas, et eas recognovit se debere eidem comiti, prout patet per predictam cedulam. Dicunt eciam quod nisi predictum finem fecisset a predicta prisoa non exiisset. Et dicunt precise quod ratione predicti inprisonamenti et pro ¹ timore ipsius Ricardi et minarum suarum predictarum fecit predictum finem cum predicto comite et non alia ratione. Requisiti ad que dampna, dicunt quod ad dampna ipsius Willelmi ccc. marcarum. Ideo consideratum est quod predictus Willelmus recuperet versus predictum Ricardum dampna [sua et quod] predictus Ricardus capiatur. Et preceptum est vicecomiti quod capiat predictum Ricardum et eum saluo custodiat etc., Et quod [habeat corpus eius] hic a die sancte Trinitatis in xv dies ad satisfaciendum domino Regi etc.

Membrane
torn.

[Ad quem d]iem vicecomes nichil inde fecit nec breue suum inde misit. Et quia testatum est quod predictus Iohannes manet in comitatu predicto [apud] Stouemarket ² vbi con[didit]. Preceptum est sicut pluries quod capiat eum etc., Et quod habeat corpus eius coram auditoribus [in crastino sancti] Michaelis ad audiendum recordum et iudicium suum de predicta inquisicione facta coram eisdem auditoribus apud [et quod ipse] tunc sit [ibi] auditurus iudicium suum etc. Ad quem diem vicecomes mandauit quod qualitercumque quod gratis se tenet in partibus remotis ita quod non potest inueniri subterfugia in retardacione iudicii supradicti, preceptum est vicecomiti quod [distringat eum etc. et quod de] exitibus etc. Et quod habeat corpus eius hic in crastino Purificacionis beate [Marie]. etc. Ad quem diem predictus Willelmus per attornatum suum venit et [Ricardus non venit sed manucaptus est] per

¹ MS. per.

² Stowmarket, Suffolk.

Iacobum de Gotheleforde, Henricum Oysel, Gerardum
 Et sunt exitus xx. solidi etc.
 Ideo inde ad iudicium. [Et consideratum est quod Willelmus
 recuperet dampna sua contra dictum] Iohannem, que taxantur
 ad xx. marcas: Et quod predictus [Iohannes eat
 ad satisfaciendum domino Regi de
 transgressionem.

On back of same. Et nisi fecerit concedit predictus W. pro
 se et heredibus suis quod vicecomes fieri faciat predictos denarios
 . . . de terris et catallis suis ad quorumcumque manus devenerint.
 Et quod idem Iohannes habeat . . . medietatem terrarum suarum
 secundum statutum, etc.

3

Defendants.—Richard de Boyland, Solomon de Rochester,
 Justices.

Complainant.—Richard Maille.

Reference to manuscript.—B., Membranes 10 & 22d.

Number of case in Appendix III., 15.

Ricardus Maille queritur de Salamone de Roffa et Ricardo Northf.
 de Boylaunde quod cum idem Ricardus breue domini Regis m. 10.
 inpetrasset, vicecomiti Northfolcie directum, ad inquiren-
 dum de malefactoribus qui mahamauerunt ipsum Ricardum de
 dextro brachio suo et ipsum depredauerunt et imprisonauerunt:
 Idem vicecomes inde fecit inquisitionem per viginti quatuor
 iuratores, et quos per illam inquisitionem inuenit culpabiles
 attachiauit et venire fecit corpora eorum coram Salamone de Roffa
 vna cum breue de mahaimio et roberia et quoddam breue de debito
 et certa breuia de noua disseisina. Vnde idem Salamon fecit
 proclamari in itinere suo de Northfolcia quod omnes qui coram eo
 implacitare voluissent breuia sua deliberassent, ac idem Ricardus
 breuia sua antea porrexisset. Idem Salamon breuia illa dilatauit
 pro donis que ab aduersis partibus recepit: excepto breue de
 mahaimio, roberia et imprisonment, quod quidem breue amisit
 Ricardo de Boilaunde et socio suo: qui quidem Ricardus predictum
 breue de die in diem dilatauit pro muneribus ab aduersariis suis
 receptis nec ad sectam predicti Ricardi Malle permisit predictus
 Ricardus de Boilaunde predictum breue implacitari, set ipsum pro

secta sua imprisonari fecit quousque Henrica vxor predicti Ricardi Maille mutuata fuit quadraginta solidos de quodam Iudeo Isaac nomine et illos soluisset pro deliberacione sua: ad dampnum ipsius Ricardo mille librarum etc.

Et Ricardus venit et dicit quod predictus Ricardus Maylle implacitabat Priorem de Sheldham¹ et homines suos de maheimio, roberia, imprisonment et aliis transgressionibus² coram eo, set dicit quod predictus Prior coram eo quoddam scriptum proferebat quod testabatur quod concordia facta fuit inter eos super omnibus transgressionibus supradictis, vnde viso illo scripto vltierus procedere non potuit: quod quidem scriptum idem prior isto eodem die proferebat in hac forma:

‘Die sancti Laurencii anno regni domini Regis Edwardi nono conuenit inter Benedictum Priorem et Conuentum de Shuldham ex parte vna et Ricardum Maylle de Stokeferye³ ex altera: videlicet quod cum idem Ricardus nuper in curia eiusdem domini Regis coram Dominis Hamone Hauteyn et Roberto de Ludham iusticiariis ad hoc assignatis, predictos priorem et conuentum et homines suos per diuersa breuia ipsius domini Regis implacitasset super transgressionibus verberature vulnerature maheimii et imprisonment: Et similiter de omnibus contencionibus et transgressionibus quibuscumque, tam de terris et tenementis quam de aliis grauaminibus quibuscumque, tam in curia domini Regis quam in curia Christianitatis vel alibi, a principio seculi vsque ad diem confectionis istius scripti, hinc inde motis vel illatis, pax inter eos in hunc modum conquieuit: videlicet quod predicti prior et conuentus pro se et hominibus suis predictis et similiter predictus pro se et suis submiserunt se de alto et basso ordinacioni, disposicioni et arbitrio domini Iohannis le Bretone, domini Willelmi Belet (vel Ade de Shrepham loco ipsius Willelmi Belet, si idem Willelmus ad hoc vacare noluerit vel non potuerit) [ex] parte ipsorum Prioris et conuentus, et domini Willelmi de Tyrintone et magistri Hugonis de Wheteringes ex parte ipsius Ricardi electorum. Ita quod iidem Iohannes et Willelmus, (vel Adam,) Willelmus, et Hugo, in premissis plenam habeant potestatem ordinandi, disponendi, audiendi, arbitrandi. et finaliter terminandi citra festum sancti Michaelis proximum

¹ Shouldham, a Gilbertine priory, near Downham Market, Norfolk.

² Cf. *Cal. Pat. Rolls, Edw. I.*, 1272-1281, pp. 446, 465, 473; 1281-1292, pp. 90, 489; 1292-1301, p. 115.

³ Stoke-Ferry, Norfolk.

sequens. Et si forte contingat predictos Iohannem et Willelmum (vel Adam), Willelmum, et Hugonem in predictis ordinacione, disposicione seu arbitrio non posse unanimiter concordare, tunc ex electione ipsorum aliquis discretus [tan]quam socius eis eligatur qui simul cum illis plenam habeat potestatem facere et arbitrari sicut ex prescriptis. Ita quod quicquid a maiori parte predictorum arbitratorum in premissis fuerit ordinatum, ex vtraque parte fideliter et absque aliqua ordinacione seu calumpnia in perpetuum teneatur. Et quod neutra pars in posterum post predictum arbitrium nec pendente arbitrio de premissis alibi possit habere actionem. Et ad maiorem securitatem faciendam et obseruandam confecta sunt duo scripta ad modum cyrographi dentata [quorum] vnum remanet penes predictos priorem et conuentum sigillo predicti Ricardi signatum, et reliquum remanet penes predictum Ricardum signatum sigillo predictorum prioris et conuentus: hiis testibus etc.'

Et quia datus fuerat partibus dies die Martis proxima post festum sancti Mathei, vt inspecto predicto scripto partibus predictis iusticie complementum partibus exciperetur vt idem Prior protulit taliter scriptum predictum, quod quidem scriptum fuit visum et lectum in curia. Et quia hoc fuit super leuacione auditorum, dictum fuit eisdem Priori et Ricardo Mayle, qui adhuc presens fuit in curia, quod essent die Lune proxima ante festum Beati Petri in Cathedra coram auditoribus facturi et recepturi in premissis quod ius suaderet: et [idem] dies datus est Ricardo de Boylund. Postea eodem die Lune venerunt prefatus Prior et prefatus Ricardus. Et predictus Ricardus, requisitus si fecit predictum scriptum et si sigillum pendens in eodem scripto sit sigillum suum, petiit quod videre possit illud scriptum, et traditum fuit ei scriptum ad videndum et consulendum super hoc. Et postea per magnum interuallum quidam extraneus reportauit idem scriptum coram auditoribus, et prefatus Ricardus recessit et sollempniter proclamatus [est] per magnam aulam et vbique in curia et non potuit inueniri, set ita recessit in contemptu curie. Itaque quidam Iohannes de Norwyco manucepit eum habendi coram auditoribus die Martis sequente, scilicet in crastino, quo die idem [Ricardus] non venit et prefati iusticiarii precise petierunt iudicium de prefato Ricardo qui comparuit in curia et petiit visum eiusdem scripti et habuit visum eiusdem scripti per auditores et postea recessit in contemptum curie ut predictum est. Et quia tam prefato Ricardo

crastinum.

Maille quam Ricardo de Boylunde datus fuit dies die Martis proxima post festum sancti Mathei, licet dictus Ricardus Maille post adiornacionem predictam inuentus fuit in curia et visum predicti scripti petierit et habuerit, et sic sine responso in contemptum curie recessit, tamen dictum fuit predicto Ricardo de Boylunde quod expectet predictum diem Martis post festum sancti Mathei. Quo die tam predictus Ricardus Maille quam predictus Ricardus de Boylunde venerunt. Et quia fuit in vltimo die termini super leuacione auditorum datus fuit eis dies in crastino Assencionis Domini de audiendo iudicio suo super premissis. Ad quem diem tam predictus Ricardus quam Ricardus venerunt et predictus Ricardus de Boylunde instanter petiit iudicium super hiis que prius petiit. Et predictus Ricardus Maille gratis reliquit toti placito predicto et petiit ipsum de nouo admitti ad replacitandum cum predicto Ricardo de Boylunde. Et concessum est ei pro Deo. Et statim placitauerunt de nouo vt patet alibi in rotulo.

Norff.
M.

Ricardus Malye queritur de Ricardo de Boylunde quondam iusticiario domini Regis in itinere Norffolcie de eo quod cum idem Ricardus Malye quoddam breue domini Regis impetrasset vicecomiti Norffolcie directum ad inquirendum de malefactoribus qui mahamauerunt ipsum Ricardum de dextro brachio suo et ipsum depredauerunt et inprisonauerunt: Idem vicecomes inde fecit inquisitionem per xxiiij^{or} iuratores et quos per illam inquisitionem inuenit culpabiles, attachiauit et venire fecit corpora eorum coram Salomone de Roffa vna cum breui de mahemio et roberia. Et quia predictus Salomone de predicto mahemio et roberia et inprisonamento cognoscere noluit quia clericus erat, misit predictum breue de mahemio Ricardo de Boylunde socio suo tunc sedenti ad placita corone apud Norwicum: qui quidem Ricardus de Boylunde predictum breue de die in diem distulit pro muneribus ab aduersariis suis receptis nec ad sectam predicti Ricardi Malie permisit dictum breue placitari, set ipsum pro secta sua capi et inprisonari fecit, in qua prisiona remansit quousque Henrica vxor predicti Ricardi soluisset quadraginta solidos pro deliberacione sua quos a quodam Iudeo Isaac nomine mutuo receperat. Nec potuit aliquo modo manucapi, et cum optulit ei sufficientes manucaptos tam clericos quam laicos quos predictus Ricardus admittere recusauit; ad dampna predicti Ricardi Malye mille librarum etc.

Et Ricardus de Boylunde per attornatum suum venit: et

quantum ad dilacionem predicti brevis dicit quod nunquam breve predictum distulit nec sectam predicti Ricardi Malye impediuit quo minus breve predictum sequi potuisset si voluisset, set dicit quod si aliqua dilacio circa breve vel sectam predicti Ricardi Malye in predicto itinere fuit, hoc fuit per negligenciam predicti Ricardi Malye et non per maliciam suam nec pro aliquibus muneribus ab aduersariis suis receptis: et de hoc ponit se super patriam, et Ricardus Malye similiter. Ideo preceptum est vicecomiti quod venire faciat hic in octabis sancti Iohannis Baptiste, xxiiij^{or}. etc. de hundredis de Clakelose, Grimeshowe et Laundiche.¹ per quos etc., Et qui nec etc., ad certificandum etc., quia tam etc. Ad quem diem predictus Ricardus Malie venit et Ricardus de Boylonde similiter. Et predictus Ricardus de Boylonde dicit quod per predicta hundreda non possunt nec debent ea que facta fuerunt in itinere iusticiariorum apud Norwicum inquiri, quia dicit quod predicta hundreda simul cum aliis hundredis in principio cuiuslibet itineris apud Norwicum adiornantur apud Lenne² et dictum est eis quod apud Lenne expectent aduentum iusticiariorum, et de hoc fit solempnis proclamacio et post proclamacionem recedunt, ita quod de factis coram iusticiariis itinerantibus apud Norwicum nichil scire poterunt: et iuratores qui modo veniunt coram auditoribus per preceptum domini Regis sunt de predictis hundredis et eodem modo adiornati fuerunt. Et petit predictus Ricardus de Boylonde quod predicta inquirantur per milites et alios liberos et legales homines qui continue residerunt in predicto itinere apud Norwicum. Et quia videbatur auditoribus et iusticiariis de Banco quod peticio predicti Ricardi de Boylonde quoad hoc fuit rationabilis, preceptum est vicecomiti quod, amotis omnibus illis de predictis hundredis, venire faciat hic in crastino Animarum (nisi iusticiarii ad assisas capiendas assignati prius ad partes illas venerint) xxiiij. tam milites quam alios liberos et legales homines de visneto de Norwico et de illis duodecim juratoribus qui continue residerunt coram iusticiariis in itinere apud Norwicum per quos etc. et qui nec etc. certificandum etc. quia tam etc. Postea die Lune proxima ante festum sancti Michaelis anno Regis nunc xix^o. apud Norwycum coram W. de Giselham et H. de Cressingham iusticiariis ad assisas capiendas assignatis etc. venerunt partes et similiter iuratores de consensu partium electi. Qui dicunt super

¹ Clackelose, Grimshoe and Launditch.² King's Lynn, Norfolk.

sacramentum suum quod predictus Ricardus de Boylonde non impediuit prefatum Ricardum Maille in itinere etc. quo minus placita sua versus predictum priorem sequi potuit etc. Dicunt etiam quod conuictum fuit in eodem itinere per quamdam iuratam ibi inter predictos Ricardum Maille et priorem captam quod predictus Ricardus Maille plures transgressiones prefato priori fecerat contra coronam et dignitatem Regis etc. Ita quod dictus Ricardus Maille per consilium curie Regis inprisonatus fuit etc. quousque domino Regi de contemptu et predicto priori de dictis transgressionibus satisfecerat, et non aliqua alia occasione nec per maliciam ipsius Ricardi de Boilonde etc.. Dicunt eciam quod predictus Ricardus de Boilonde nichil cepit de predicto priore occasione premissa etc., nec de predicto Ricardo Maille pro deliberacione sua etc. Ideo consideratum est quod predictus Ricardus de Boylonde quoad ipsum Ricardum Maylle inde eat quietus sine die, et predictus Ricardus Maille in misericordia.

Et quoad xl.s. dicit predictus Ricardus de Boylonde quod ipse et socii sui tunc iusticiarii itinerantes in comitatu Norffolcie habuerunt potestatem inquirendi de illis qui placitauerunt placita corone coram iudicibus ecclesiasticis: vnde compertum fuit per inquisitionem quod predictus Ricardus Maille implacitauit priorem de Schuldham coram commissariis Archiepiscopi Cantuariensis de mahemio etc. ad dampna predicti prioris xl.s. etc. Ideo consideratum fuit quod predictus prior recuperaret dampna sua predicta et quod predictus Ricardus committeretur gaole, et de hoc vocat recordum rotulorum suorum. Postea visi sunt rotuli predicti Ricardi qui sunt in thesauro in quibus continentur hec verba:

‘Conuictum est per iuratam in quam Benedictus prior de Schuldham querens et Ricardus Maille se posuerunt quod idem Ricardus iniuste vexauit et implacitauit predictum priorem in curia Christianitatis coram Archiepiscopo Cantuariense qui nunc et secutus fuit coram eo quoddam placitum de mahemio et bateria: quod quidem placitum non fuit de testamento nec matrimonio set ad coronam et dignitatem domini Regis pertinebat: ad dampna predicti prioris quadraginta solidorum. Ideo consideratum est quod predictus prior recuperet predicta dampna sua, que taxantur ad xl. solidos, et Ricardus custodiretur.’

Et quia compertum est per predictum¹ recordum quod predictus prior habuit predictos quadraginta solidos et non predictus

¹ MS. precord.

Ricardus de Boilonde sicut Ricardus Maille ei imposuit, consideratum est quod predictus Ricardus de Boilonde eat inde quietus sine die, et predictus Ricardus Maille in misericordia.

4

Defendant.—Henry de Bray, Escheator.

Complainant.—Alice, daughter of Hugh de Broadwinsor.

Reference to manuscript.—B., Membrane 14d.

No other references.

Number of case in Appendix III., 21.

Alicia filia et heres Hugonis de Brodewyndelesores, existens in custodia Radulfi de Aubeny per donum domini Regis, queritur de magistro Henrico de Bray quod cum Iohannes de Wyndelesoure tenuit manerium de Bradewyndelesoure¹ de Rege in capite et illud dedit Iohanni filio et heredi suo tenendum in capite de domino Rege, obiit predictus Iohannes sine herede de corpore suo exeunte, per quod hereditarium descendebat predicto Hugoni tanquam fratri et heredi, et mortuo predicto Hugone descendebat predictae Alicie tanquam filie et heredi, existente eadem Alicia infra etatem et in custodia Regis. Obiit quidam Iohannes auus predictae Alicie seisisus de manerio de Ellyngestoke² in comitatu Suthamtonie per quod ius illius manerii descendebat predictae Alicie; vnde magister Henricus de Bray cepit illud manerium in manum domini Regis dum eadem Alicia fuit in custodia domini Regis: et interim fecit predictus Henricus quoddam makementum maritagii inter quandam alumpniam ipsius magistri Henrici et quemdam Galfridum filium Iohannis de Wyndelesoure primi superius nominati, per quod quidem maritagium dominus Rex est extra seisinam predicti manerii quod deberet habere in custodia ratione ipsius Alicie: per quod predicta Alicia petit quod dominus Rex non patiat eam inde exheredari durante custodia predicta.

Preterea persona ecclesie de Ellingestoke durante predicto tempore obiit, domino Rege tunc extra regnum suum agente, ad quam quidem ecclesiam dominus Rex debuit presentasse durante custodia ipsius Alicie, vnde predictus Henricus persona est absque

¹ Broadwinsor, near Beaminster, Dorset.

² *I.e.*, Eledestoke, Old-stoke, or Stoke Charity, Hampshire.

presentacione domini Regis ad exheredacionem ipsius Alicie, etc. Et magister Henricus venit et dicit ad hoc quod Iohannes le Chapeleyn, qui sequitur pro dicta Alicia, dicit quod Iohannes auus predictae Alicie obiit seiscitus de predicto manerio de Ellingestoke, quod non. Dicit enim quod post mortem predicti Iohannis seisiuit predictum manerium in manum domini Regis et illud tenuit, per quod predictus Galfridus filius Iohannis adiuit cancellariam domini Regis et impetrauit breue de inquisicione directum eidem Henrico, auctoritate cuius breuis predictus Henricus diligentem inde fecit inquisitionem : per quam compertum fuit quod predictus Iohannes non obiit seiscitus de dicto manerio, eo quod diu ante mortem suam feoffauerat predictum Galfridum, qui quidem Galfridus inde fuit plene et pacifice in seiscina die quo predictus Iohannes obiit; que quidem inquisicio retornata fuit in cancellariam; per quam quidem inquisitionem idem Galfridus habuit breue directum eidem Henrico quod a predicto manerio ipsum amoueret et quod amplius se inde non intromitteret. Et vnde dicit quod porrecto illi illo breui statim se amouit.

crastinum.

Et quoad receptionem illius ecclesie dicit predictus Henricus quod presentatus fuit ad predictam ecclesiam duobus annis elapsis postquam breue ei venit quod de dictis tenementis non se intromitteret. Et predictus Iohannes le Chapeleyn requisitus si predicta inquisicio capta fuit sicut predictus Henricus dicit vel non, et dicit quod sic.

5

Defendant.—William de Brompton.

Complainant.—Roger de Thornton.

Reference to manuscript.—B., Membrane 9.

Other references.—B., Membranes 1, 1d, 2, 3, 4, 12d, 24, 33d.

Number of case in Appendix III., 52.

Cant.
m. 9.

Rogerus de Thorntone queritur de Willelmo de Brumpton quod cum inhibitum sit per statutum domini Regis quod nullus minister Regis in curia Regis placita coram se mota manuteneat seu procuret, idem Willelmus Hugonem filium Henrici in quodam placito inter predictum Hugonem et Rogerum [coram] predicto Willelmo in Banco motum manutenebat sub hac forma, videlicet

quod cum idem Hugo breue suum versus predictum Rogerum de consanguinitate tulisset de morte Iohannis filii Iohannis consanguinei sui, de tenementis in Hyntone¹ et Wylburgham,² ac ex parte predicti Rogeri exceptum fuit contra breue quod due fuerunt Wylberham, videlicet Magna et Parua, et in predicto breui inde non fiebat mencio, vnde petebat iudicium [de] predicto breui si ad hoc deberet respondere, predictus Willelmus predictam excepcionem ei noluit allocare.

Preterea vbi predictus Rogerus pro se proposuit quod ad illud breue non deberet respondere, eo quod predictus Hugo post mortem predicti Iohannis consanguinei sui, de cuius morte istud breue suscitauit, predictum Rogerum de predictis tenementis recenter eiecit, per quod idem Rogerus versus predictum Hugonem breue [noue] disseisine impetrauit: Et tunc compertum fuit per assisam per assensum parcium inde inter eos captam quod predictus Iohannes non obiit inde vltimo seisitus sicut breue suum voluit: Unde idem Rogerus inde petiit iudicium, set nichil ei allocatum fuit, nec iusticiarii propter mayntenementum predicti Willelmi aliquod iudicium inde voluerunt reddere, set contra legem fecerunt ipsum in patriam se ponere.

Preterea cum in patriam de predicto placito se posuisset predictus Willelmus contra ipsum dies de gratia concessit ac si fuisset in placito dotis et hoc quolibet adiornamento vsque ad finem placiti. Et quando vicecomes breue suum retornavit et nomina iuratorum in panello semel et alias, predictus Willelmus iuratores in panello nominatos non permisit iurare eo quod non credebat ipsos per eum nec per predictum Hugonem fuisse ad hoc procuratos.

Preterea cum tercio vicecomes retornauit panellum suum de triginta hominibus, videlicet tam militibus quam aliis etc. et quinque vel sex de illis iura[tores et] alios noluit permittere iurare, set precepit eis quod irent domibus: set postea fecit exire magnam districcionem et fecit irrotulare nomina iuratorum quos voluit et qui nunquam per vicecomitem fuerunt summoniti. Ad quem diem predictus Willelmus fecit testificare in Banco quod predictus Rogerus demersus fuit cum tota familia sua in Mari Hibernie vt partereret³ attornatos predicti Rogeri et qui quidem attornati propter predictum Willelmum non ausi fuerunt ibi respondere. Et sic inuenit occasionem capiendi predicta tene-

¹ Cherry Hinton, near Cambridge, Cambs.

² Great Wilbraham and Little Wilbraham, Cambs.

³ Sic.

menta in manum domini Regis propter defaultam factam post apparenciam. Et postea idem Willelmus dedit diem eidem Rogero continentem spacium vnus mensis ad audiendum iudicium suum. Et vnde idem Rogerus amisit seisinam terre sue per mayntenementum et fauorem predicti Willelmi. Et hoc paratus est verificare per quod curia consideret.

Preterea cum predictus Rogerus ad sequendum placitum suum in curia Regis venisset idem Willelmus omnibus narratoribus curiam inhiuit ne quis eorum predicto Rogero assisteret, et hoc contra legem et statutum domini Regis.

Preterea predictus Willelmus militibus et aliis amicis suis ad torniamentum de Staunforde¹ mandauit quod filium predicti Rogeri ibidem inter eos occiderent, ad dampnum etc.

Et Willelmus venit et dicit quod vbi predictus Rogerus queritur quod per fauorem predicti Willelmi ei iniuriatum fuit, ita quod terram suam amisit per defaultam, bene defendit quod nunquam in predicto placito iniustum aut indebitum fauorem prestitit. Et de hoc ponit se super recordum iusticiariorum de Banco. Et ad hoc quod Rogerus dicit quod predictus Willelmus subtraxit ei consilium suum, inhiuendo narratoribus ne ei assisterent, scilicet Willelmo de Bereforde, Nicholao de Warwyke, Ricardo de Gosefelde, Rogero de Hegham, et Hugoni de Louther, idem Willelmus de plano se ponit in veredicto eorum. Qui sunt examinati et quale sit dictum eorum potest consilium auditorum recordare.

crastino.

Postea in crastino Purificacionis beate Marie anno regni Regis nunc vicesimo veniunt hic predicti Rogerus et Willelmus, et Rogerus instanter petit iudicium etc. Et predictus Willelmus similiter. Et quia non constat Petro de Leycestria et sociis suis tunc auditoribus, super examinatione iusticiariorum et narratorum predictorum alias facta per episcopum Wyntoniensem et socios suos, mandatum est predicto episcopo et sociis suis quod mittant inde recordum suum hic a die Pasche in tres septimanas. Et idem dies datus est predictis Rogero et Willelmo ad audiendum tunc predictum recordum etc.

Postea in crastino Ascensionis Domini anno regni Regis nunc vicesimo veniunt predicti Rogerus et Willelmus. Et predictus Willelmus quoad excepcionem illam de Parua Wylburgham et Magna Wylburgham eidem Rogero non allocatam ad cassandum breue quod predictus Hugo tulit super predictum

¹ Stamford, Lincolnshire.

Rogerum, dicit quod idem Rogerus per predictum breue petiit predicta tenementa versus Iohannem filium Iohannis Porthorse de Cantebrigia, et idem Iohannes vocauit eundem Rogerum ad warrantum uersus eundem Hugonem de tenementis per predictum breue petitis, vnde dicit quod predicta excepcio non debuit predicto Rogero allocari, immo predicto Iohanni. Et desicut excepcio illa debuit eidem Iohanni allocari si ipsam proposuisset pro loco et tempore et non eidem Rogero, petit iudicium si debeat eidem Rogero ad illum articulum respondere, et Rogerus similiter. Et Rogerus iterum dicit quod predictus Willelmus predicto die quando sex de predicto pannello iuratores fuerunt, idem Willelmus reiecit panellum predictum et precepit iuratoribus quod irent domibus. Et misit certa nomina in quodam pannello sub sigillo suo vicecomiti Cantebrigie et per litteras suas deprecatorias et minatorias directas vicecomiti predicto mandauit quod venire faceret illos quorum nomina ei sic misit. Et eciam alios iuratores poni fecit in pannello quos voluit per minas quas fecit vicecomiti predicto, que quidem nomina in aliis panellis prius per vicecomitem non fuerunt apposita, et insuper idem Willelmus in propria persona sua accessit ad partes predictas et procurauit iuratores illius inquisitionis pro predicto Hugone per litteras suas deprecatorias eisdem iuratoribus directas. Et quoad hoc quod idem Rogerus dicit quod idem Willelmus inhibuit narratoribus ne essent de consilio ipsius Rogeri: Elyas de Bekingham et Willelmus de Bereforde super hoc examinati dicunt se nichil scire quod idem Willelmus nunquam prohibuit narratores quin bene possent fuisse de consilio ipsius Rogeri. Et Nicholaus de Warrwicke, Rogerus de Hegham, et Hugo de Louthre iurati et examinati super premissis dicunt super sacramentum suum quod nunquam inhibuit eis per aliquem quin bene possent fuisse de consilio ipsius Rogeri in predicto placito. Et Robertus Crestyen, unus attornatorum ipsius Rogeri, iuratus et examinatus coram eisdem, dicit quod predictus Willelmus nunquam ei minas fecit in banco die quo defensio illa intrata fuit nec aliquid aliud sibi fecit vel dixit per quod minus bene sequi posset vel respondisse pro predicto Rogero: set dicit quod quia communis clamor erat in partibus Cantebrigie et in curia ista quod predictus Rogerus mortuus fuit et eciam quia Ordinarii illius patrie sequestrarunt bona ipsius Rogeri occasione mortis sue, inponendo ipsum mortuum fuisse, elongauit se de banco die predictae defencionis facte, et non

ob aliam causam finxit se respondere pro predicto Rogero die predicto. Et ad alias probaciones quas idem Rogerus modo proponit et alias proposuit, videlicet quod idem Willelmus, postquam ipsi Hugo et Rogerus posuerunt se in quamdam inquisitionem in quodam breui de iudicio quod exiuit de distringendo iuratores electos per vicecomitem, poni fecit quedam nomina iuratorum que in aliis panellis per vicecomitem prius non fuerunt apposita, respondit idem Willelmus quod ipse ad contenta in breui illo non habet necesse respondere, eo quod ipse non est testis in breui illo et eciam quod quidam clericus domini Regis adeo bene iuratus domino Regi vt iusticiarius fuit custos et factor huiusmodi breuium de iudicio et inde respondere tenetur: vnde petit iudicium si ipse de aliquo facto respondere teneatur, precipue cum idem clericus nichil extra debitum officii sui tenebatur facere eciam si hoc in preceptis ab aliquo iusticiario haberet. Et ad hoc quod idem Rogerus dicit quod predictus Willelmus per breuia sua et per minas factas vicecomiti loci illius poni fecit iuratores quos voluit, respondit idem Willelmus quod vicecomes qui tunc fuit familiaris domini Regis et eius iuratus et non tenebatur per minas aut procuracionem alicuius aliquid facere nisi quod ad officium suum [s]pectauit. Vnde si idem vicecomes tunc aliquid fecit quod facere non debuit respondeat ipse de facto suo. Vnde ipse Willelmus petit iudicium si ipse respondere debeat de aliquo precepto aut aliqua procuracione priusquam idem vicecomes de aliquo facto conuincatur. Et ad hoc quod idem Rogerus dicit quod idem Willelmus in propria persona accessit ad predictos iuratores et eos induxit per dona et jocalia ad dicendum contra ipsum Rogerum, petit idem Willelmus iudicium si ipse ad hoc respondere teneatur desicut idem Rogerus nullos certos iuratores nominat quibus idem Willelmus aliqua dona contulit, et eciam desicut nulla inquisicio capta fuit per ipsos nec idem Rogerus [Rogerus¹] per ipsorum veredictum aliquid amisit nec aliquo modo nisi per hoc quod ipse fecit defaltam postquam comparuit in curia; et quod attornati sui dixerunt in plena curia quod dominus eorum mortuus fuit et quod ipsi vlterius ipsum in placito predicto defendere noluerunt, vnde idem Rogerus erga ipsos accionem habet et non erga eum. Et ad hoc quod idem Rogerus dicit quod predictus Willelmus [contra eum]² dedit breuiore dies gratie in predicto placito et precipue postquam defalta predicta facta fuit, ita quod si idem Rogerus

¹ Sic.² Word rubbed out.

habuisset . . . diem communem posset ipse venisse et defaltam illam sanasse quoquo modo: respondit idem Willelmus quod prefixio dierum in hu[iusmodi casibus] semper hucusque fuit arbitraria ad voluntatem iusticiariorum habito respectu ad distanciam comitatum vbi terre petite s[unt, et] non ad absenciam partis postquam litem fuit ingressus: et, preterea postquam attornati sui venerunt in curiam, et dixerunt de plano quod litem inceptam vltius defendere noluerunt et sic recesserunt in contemptum c[urie]. [Ideo] per iuris rigorem terra petita de plano fuit recuperanda prout quod grauius puniri debet presentis quam absentis . . . non fuit mirum si parti petenti brevis dies fuit assignatus. Vnde idem Willelmus petit iudicium si de huiusmodi [dierum] prefixione necesse habet respondere, presertim cum ad proximum diem se essoniasse potuisset de seruicio domini Regis [et] tempus satis prolongasse. Et de hoc quod idem Rogerus non respondet ad premissa, set semper tenet se ad verificacionem patrie d[e hiis] que facta fuerunt in banco apud Westmonasterium petit idem Willelmus iudicium. Et si hec non sufficiant dicit aliud. Et Rogerus dicit quod predictus Willelmus prefixit ei diem a die sancti Michaelis in tres septimanas vsque ad octabas sancti Martini, infra quem diem ipse, qui tunc erat in partibus Hibernie, non potuit venire ad saluandam defaltam suam. Et sic dicit prefatus Rogerus quod per fauorem indebitum ipsius Willelmi amisit ipse terram suam. Postea licet predictus Willelmus pro se proposuisset quod prefixiones dierum sunt ad voluntatem iusticiariorum, consideratis tamen distanciis locorum vbi terre petite sunt et quod per responsionem attornatorum predicti Rogeri, qui dicebant se nolle vltius dominum suum defendere propter rumores predictos, procedi potuit ad iudicium sine iuris offensa, merito potuerunt iusticiarii et debuerunt breuem diem assignare ad capiendum terram in manum Regis quia cum idem Rogerus queritur quod idem Willelmus assignauit [ei diem] a die sancti Michaelis in tres septimanas vsque ad octabas sancti Martini, ita quod ipse, qui tunc erat in partibus Hibernie, infra tam [breue tempus] non potuit venire ad defaltam suam [saluandum] iudicialiter quod ipse ad videlicet utrum dedit diem illum prefixit.

Four lines
torn out.

6

Defendant.—John de Chertsey, clerk to William de Brompton.

Complainant.—John, son of Roger de Reed.

Reference to manuscript.—B., Membrane 3d.

Other references.—B., Membranes 4, 24d.

Number of case in Appendix III., 65.

Suff.
m. 3d.

Iohannes filius Rogeri de Reda¹ queritur de Iohanne de Certeseye nuper clerico Willelmi de Brumpton quod cum ipse Iohannes de Reda infra etatem existens dimisisset quamdam partem tenementorum hereditatis sue cuidam Ricardo de Certeseye ad terminum septem annorum, de quibus quidem tenementis idem Iohannes de Rede nunquam prius fuit seiscitus: et quia videbatur predictis Iohanne de Certesey et Ricardo quod predictus Ricardus non fuit satis securus de predicto termino nisi haberet quamdam cartam feoffamenti fecerunt eis vnam cartam feoffamenti: et postea iidem Ricardus et Iohannes de Certeseye deduxerunt predictum Iohannem de Rede apud Westmonasterium coram iusticiariis et ibidem inde fecerunt quemdam finem leuari absque examinatione iusticiariorum et absque breui et absque summonicione et absque ordine curie.² Et vnde queritur quod cum idem Iohannes de Rede postea intellexerat quod fuerat finis in curia, et cuiusmodi virtutis, fecit quemdam Iohannem de Ramesey nomine suo predictum finem calumpniare, set ignorat vtrum predicta calumpnia sit irrotulata vel non, eo quod predictus Iohannes de Certesey fuit tunc clericus in Banco: istam falsitatem et falsum finem fecit predictus Iohannes leuari ad exheredacionem predicti Iohannis de Rede et ad dampna ipsius Iohannis c. librarum etc.

Et Iohannes de Certesey venit et dicit quod predictus Iohannes de Reda dimisit predicta tenementa cuidam Ricardo de Certeseye ad terminum septem annorum: et ne idem Iohannes de Rede aliquo casu alium infra predictum terminum de predictis tenementis feoffaret, predictus Ricardus ita locutus fuit secum vt faceret ei quamdam cartam feoffamenti et predictus Iohannes de Rede sic fecit. Et postea predictus Iohannes de Rede, per conuencionem inter

¹ Reed, Suffolk.

² Cf. *Feet of Fines*, 15 Edw. I., case 215, file 39, no. 117.

ipsum et predictum Ricardum factam, venit per breue domini Regis in curiam coram iusticiariis, quod quidem breue idem Iohannes de Rede impetrauit sumptibus suis propriis, et ibidem concessit predicta tenementa prefato Ricardo de Charteseie, et inde solempniter leuauit finem in sua propria persona. Et quia quedam Isabella mater predicti Iohannis de Rede tenuit partem predictorum tenementorum in dotem, predicta Isabella venit in curiam coram prefatis iusticiariis per breue domini Regis, et ibi fuit in leuacione predicti finis et ad hoc bene consenciebat, et postea statim fecit fidelitatem predicto Ricardo. Et quod ita sit et quod predictus Iohannes de Certeseye nullam aliam decepcionem fecit in curia in predicto fine leuando nec aliquam aliam falsitatem, ponit se super breue domini Regis per quod predictum finem leuauit, quod quidem breue est in filiis et super notam et pedem eiusdem finis. Et Iohannes de Rede [dicit] quod ipse nunquam coram iusticiariis ibidem venit, nec per se nec per attornatum, nec per aliquod breue fuit ipse summonitus per quod hujus[modi] finem potuit leuare. Et hoc paratus est verificare per quicquid curia consideret. Et predictus Iohannes de Certeseye venit et dicit sicut prius quod nunquam aliquam falsitatem fecit per quam predictum finem leuauit, set dicit quod predictum finem leuauit rite et secundum ordinem curie prout supradictum est, et petit quod inspiciantur rotuli de Banco breue et nota et pes eiusdem finis de anno xv. de in crastino Assencionis Domini. Et datus est dies partibus a die Pasche in tres septimanas. Et interim inspiciantur rotuli etc.

7

Defendant.—John de Chester, clerk to Ralph de Hengham.

Complainants.—Henry le Keu, and Agnes his wife.

Reference to manuscript.—B., Membrane 5.

No other references.

Number of case in Appendix III., 66.

Henricus le Keu et Agnes vxor eius queruntur de Iohanne de Cestria de eo quod cum predicti Henricus et Agnes tulissent quoddam breue de inprisonamento versus Thomam de Lincolnia et Ricardum Note et alios coram Radulfo de Hengham et sociis

Lond.
m. 5.

suis iusticiariis domini Regis de eo quod predicti [Thomas¹] Ricardus et alii predictam Agnetem apud Bureforde² ceperunt et inprisonauerunt, ibi venit dictus Iohannes de Cestria clericus dicti Radulfi et sustinuit placitum predictum pro predictis Thoma et Ricardo contra predictos Henricum et Agnetem et aduocauit quemdam Iohannem de Bele attornatum in placito predicto ad placitandum cum predictis Henrico et Agnete, vbi predictus Iohannes de Bele nunquam fuit attornatus. Dicunt eciam quod dictus Iohannes de Cestria in capcione inquisicionis de inprisonamento predicto solus sedebat in banco sine presencia iusticiariorum et predictam inquisicionem de emulis ipsorum Henrici et Agnetis cepit nec aliquas calumpnias eorum allocare voluit. Dicunt eciam Henricus et Agnes quod cum prosequi debuissent breuia sua iudicialia predictum inprisonamentum tangencia in ecclesia sancti Swithini in Candoweke Strete³ coram Iohanne de Cestria qui tunc breuia iudicialia coram dicto Radulfo [de] Hengham fecit et liberauit, ibi venit predictus Iohannes de Cestria, qui sustinuit aduersarios suos contra ipsos Henricum et Agnetem [et dictam] Agnetem verberauit et sanguinem ab ea extraxit et per pedes suos extra ecclesiam et per vicum contra hostium predictae ecclesie famili[ariter tra]here fecit per pedes, ad dampnum predictorum Henrici et Agnetis xx. librarum et contra pacem domini Regis etc.

Et predictus Iohannes venit et dicit quoad hoc quod predicti Henricus et Agnes inponunt ei quod sustinuit predictum Iohannem de Belce a[ttornatum ubi nunquam fuit] attornatus dicit quod non tenetur eis hic inde respondere. Quia dicit quod predicti Henricus et Agnes placitauerunt cum predicto [Iohanni de Belce sicut] cum attornato coram predicto domino Radulfo de Hengham in toto placito predicto vsque ad finem placiti nec in toto [placito dixerunt eum] attornatum non fuisse coram predicto Radulfo et sociis suis et de hoc petit iudicium. Et predicti Henricus et Agnes non [possunt denegare. Ideo] consideratum est quod predictus Iohannes quoad hoc eat quietus.

Et quoad hoc quod predicti Henricus et Agnes ei inponunt quod verberauit et verberare fecit predictam Agnetem dicit quod [nunquam eandem Agnetem verberauit] nec verberare fecit nec per pedes ipsam trahere fecit in ecclesia nec extra sicut ei inponunt et hoc petit quod [inquiratur. Et Henricus et Agnes]

¹ MS. Rogerus.

² Burford, Oxon.

³ Candlewick St. Later called St. Swithin, London-Stone.

similiter. Ideo preceptum est vicecomitibus Londonie quod venire faciant hic in octabis sancti Hillarii xxiiij. etc. de visneto etc. et qui nec etc., ad certificandum etc. quia tam etc. Et quoad hoc quod predicti Henricus et Agnes sibi inponunt quod solus cepit predictam inquisitionem sine iusticiariis dicit quod Walterus [de Winburne] iusticiarius consors Radulfi de Hengham sedebat tunc in Banco et cepit predictam inquisitionem et petit iudicium etc. et predicti Henricus et Agnes [idem] cognoscunt. Ideo predictus Johannes quoad hoc quietus etc.

Postea in octabis sancti Hillarii anno regni regis Edwardi xx^o. crastinum.
venerunt predicti Henricus et Agnes vxor eius, Iohannes de Cestria et iuratores similiter: qui dicunt super sacramentum suum quod predictus Iohannes nunquam predictam Agnetem verberavit nec verberare fecit, nec per pedes trahere in ecclesia predicta nec extra, sicut predicti Henricus et Agnes ei inponunt, nec aliqua enormia ei intulit. Ideo consideratum est quod predictus Johannes eat inde quietus. Et predicti Henricus et Agnes nichil capiant pro querela sua, set sint in misericordia pro falso clamio predicto. misericordia.
Et postea condonatur misericordia per auditores.

8

Defendants.—Ralph de Hengham, William de Brompton, William de Saham.

Complainants.—Henry de la Leghe and Nicholas de Cerne.

References to manuscript.—B., Membranes 16, 16d, 15.

Other references.—B., Membranes 3, 4, 5d, 7d, 8d, 23, 24d, 32.

Number of case in Appendix III., 53.

Ostensum est auditoribus querelarum per Henricum de la Leghe et Nicholaum de Cernes quod cum communis fama per totum comitatum Bedefordie volasset quod homicidia burgaria latrocinia et felonie per quosdam malefactores eiusdem comitatus post vltimum iter iusticiariorum habitum in eodem comitatu perpetrata fuissent: unde Willelmus de Boyuille tunc vicecomes Bedefordie vna cum coronatoribus eiusdem comitatus cepit quamdā inquisitionem primo per xij. probos et legales homines Bedeford
m. 16.

de hundredo de Wyxstonstre¹: qui iuratores recognouerunt per sacramentum suum quod Ricardus filius Hugonis quondam persone ecclesie de Temesforde² propter homicidium vtlagatus fuit in vltimo itinere iusticiariorum in comitatu Buckinghamie: et quod Radulfus frater eiusdem Ricardi vtlagatus fuit in vltimo itinere Bedefordie propter homicidia burgaria domorum et alias felonias per ipsum factas in comitatu predicto: et quod Willelmus filius persone predicte, frater eorundem Ricardi et Radulfi, eosdem Radulfum et Ricardum sic vtlagatos sepius in domo sua in Temesforde que est in hundredo de Bukleswade³ recepit: ad quam quidem inquisicionem predicti xij. iuratores sigilla sua apposuerunt. Postea predictus vicecomes ad corroborandum magis inquisicionem per prefatos xij. iuratores factam fieri fecit aliam inquisicionem per xvij. probos et legales homines de hundredo de Bykleswade. Qui iuratores indictauerunt predictos Ricardum et Radulfum de latrocinio et homicidiis et aliis malis multimodis, et predictum Willelmum filium persone, fratrem eorum, de receptamento eorum postquam vtlagati fuerunt. Vnde idem Willelmus hoc percipiens adiuit curiam Regis et per consilium et auxilium Radulfi de Bello Campo et Willelmi de Brumpton qui eum manutenuerunt, impetrauit quoddam breue sub hac forma:

primum
breue.

‘Edwardus Dei gratia etc. vicecomiti Bedfordie salutem. Cum Willelmus filius persone de Temesforde indictatus de receptamento Radulfi fratris sui per maliciam et procuracionem quorundam maliuolencium prout assercione fidelium intelleximus, venisset in curia nostra coram locum nostrum tenentibus et reddidisset se prisone nostre ad standum inde recto, facturus eciam et recepturus quod iustum fuerit: tibi precipimus quod indictamentum illud sub sigillis indictancium habeas coram nobis vel locum nostrum tenentibus in octabis sancti Martini vbicunque tunc fuerimus vel fuerint in Anglia. Et venire facias coram nobis vel locum nostrum tenentibus ad prefatum terminum xxiiij. de visneto de Bereforde⁴ et Temesforde, ita vt inspecto indictamento predicto per racionem xxiiij. procedi possit ad iudicium super indictamento illo quatenus de iure fuerit procedendum. Et tu ipse tunc sis ibi in propria persona tua vel subuicecomes tuus ad certificandum nos de indictamento predicto et ad videndum quod predictum indictamentum per iuratores idoneos terminetur. Et habeas ibi nomina

¹ Wixamtree.

² Tempsford.

³ Biggleswade.

⁴ Barford.

iuratorum et hoc breue. Teste Radulfo de Hengham xxiiij. die Octobris anno xv°.

Et vicecomes executus fuit mandatum Regis sicut debebat et venire fecit xxiiij. homines de comitatu Bedfordie quos predictus Radulfus de Bello Campo procurauerat et tales quales idem Willelmus volebat. De quibus xij. electi qui fuerunt tenentes predicti Radulfi manutentoris predicti Willelmi. Et iuratores dixerunt super sacramentum suum quod predictus Willelmus de receptamento fratrum suorum non fuit culpabilis. Et requisiti vltierius per iusticiarios tenentes locum Regis per cuius procuracionem idem Willelmus filius persone indictatus fuit de receptamento predicto, dixerunt, sicut per predictum Radulfum et Willelmum de Brumpton eis preceptum fuit, quod per Henricum de la Leye et Nicholaum de Cernes. Unde Radulfus de Hengham exire fecit aliud breue vicecomiti Bedfordie directum sub hac forma:

Edwardus etc. vicecomiti Bedfordie salutem. Precipimus tibi quod capias Henricum de la Leye et Nicholaum de Cernes si inuenti fuerint in balliua tua et eos saluo in prisona nostra custodias. Ita quod habeas corpora eorum [coram] nobis vel locum nostrum tenentibus in octabis sancti Hillarii, vbicumque tunc fuerimus vel fuerint in Anglia, ad respondendum Willelmo filio Hugonis quondam persone ecclesie de Temesforde, de placito quare abbettauerunt ipsum Willelmum indictari de pluribus latrociniiis homicidiis et receptamentis Ricardi et Radulfi fratrum suorum postquam fuerunt vtlagati, vnde idem Willelmus ad sectam nostram inde per inquisicionem coram nobis factam quietus recessit. Et habeas ibi hoc breue. Teste Radulfo de Hengham apud Westmonasterium xxiiij. die Nouembris anno xv°.

secundum
breue.

Unde predicti Henricus et Nicholaus queruntur de predictis iusticiariis et maxime de Radulfo de Hengham de eo quod data brevis capcionis eorundem Henrici et Nicholai excesserat datam inquisicionis capte in crastino octabarum sancti Martini bene per quinque dies ad minus, per quam quidem inquisicionem iidem Henricus et Nicholaus indictati fuerunt de abbetto indictamenti facti super Willelmum filium persone de receptamento fratrum suorum predictorum. Et postea in octabis sancti Hillarii venerunt predicti Henricus et Nicholaus et dixerunt quod non plus per illos quam per alios fuit ille Willelmus filius persone indictatus de receptamento predicto et super hoc posuerunt se super patriam. Unde tale breue exiuit:

tercium breue.

‘Edwardus etc. vicecomiti Bedfordie salutem. Precipimus tibi quod venire facias coram nobis vel locum nostrum tenentibus a die Pasche in tres septimanas vbicumque tunc etc. xxiiij. tam milites quam alios etc. per quos etc., et qui nec Willelmum filium Hugonis quondam persone ecclesie de Temesforde nec Henricum de la Leye et Nicholaum de Cernes aliqua affinitate attingant: ad recognoscendum super sacramentum suum si predicti Henricus et Nicholaus abbettauerunt ipsum Willelmum indictari de pluribus latrociniiis et homicidiis et receptamento Ricardi et Radulfi fratrum suorum postquam vtlagati fuerunt, sicut predictus Willelmus dicit, vel non, sicut predicti Henricus et Nicholaus dicunt. Quia tam predicti Henricus et Nicholaus quam predictus Willelmus, inter quos contencio est, posuerunt se inde in inquisitionem illam. Et habeas ibi nomina iuratorum et hoc breue. Teste Radulfo de Hengham apud Westmonasterium iiij. die Februarii anno xvj^o.’

Ad quem diem in breui contentum coronatores Bedfordie qui primam inquisitionem indictamenti de receptamento ceperunt et alii xxv. tam milites quam alii liberi et legales homines de comitatu predicto venerunt coram iusticiariis predictis ad recognoscendum si Willelmus filius persone per abbettum predictorum Henrici et Nicholai indictatus fuisset de receptamento predicto vel non plus quam per alios xxx. iuratores de duobus hundredis et dimidio qui ipsum Willelmum primo indictauerunt. Qui quidem coronatores et xxv. tam milites quam alii calumpniati fuerunt per predictum Willelmum, qui dixit quod omnes procurati fuerunt et per illam solam calumpniam omnes illi iuratores calumpniati fuerunt et recusati. Et hoc sicut predicti Henricus et Nicholaus dicunt factum fuit per procuracionem Willelmi de Brumpton cuius robas gerebat. Et propter illam calumpniam dies datus fuit partibus a die sancte Trinitatis in xv. dies. Ad quem diem predicti Henricus et Nicholaus venerunt et optulerunt se versus predictum Willelmum, qui non venit; et idem Willelmus in misericordia. Et predicti Henricus et Nicholaus inde sine die. Unde tale factum fuit irrotulamentum:

Irrotulamen-
tum.

‘Henricus de la Leye et Nicholaus de Cernes optulerunt se iiij. die versus Willelmum filium Hugonis quondam persone ecclesie de Temesforde de placito quare predicti Henricus et Nicholaus abbettauerunt ipsum Willelmum indictari de latrociniiis homicidiis et receptamento Ricardi et Radulfi fratrum suorum

postquam vtlagati fuerunt et postquam Henricus et Nicholaus posuerunt se in iuratum illam. Et ipse non venit et fuit querens. Ideo consideratum est quod predicti Henricus et Nicholaus eant inde sine die, et predictus et plegii sui de prosecucione in misericordia.'

Postea venit predictus Willelmus de Temesforde et tulit tale breue :

'Edwardus etc. vicecomiti Bedfordie salutem. Quia iura- Breue.
tores cuiusdam inquisicionis inter Willelmum filium Hugonis quondam persone de Temesforde querentem et Henricum de la Leye et Nicholaum de Cernes de placito transgressionis minus fuerunt sufficientes suspecti et calumpniati, tibi precipimus quod amotis omnibus illis, scilicet Roberto le Crevquer, Galfrido Roolande, Willelmo le Harper, Hugone Oyldeboef, Hugone le Blont, Thoma cum barba, Simone Frankeleyn, Almarico de Laundres, Iohanne filio Iohannis de Colmorde, Willelmo Tyuille, Iohanne le Iouene, Willelmo Mordant, Willelmo Boynon, Ricardo de Blenes, Iohanne de Exemouthe, Willelmo le Child, Henrico de Dywyke, Henrico de Flamuile, Ricardo Malherb, Willelmo de Haspey, Iohanne Chann, Willelmo Maunsel, Ricardo Andreu, Roberto Lecite et Simone le Chann, et loco eorum venire facias coram nobis vel locum nostrum tenentibus a die sancte Trinitatis in tres septimanas vbicumque etc. xxiiij. milites etc. et legales homines etc. de visneto de Temesforde per quos etc., et qui nec predictos Willelmum nec Henricum nec Nicholaum aliqua affinitate etc. ad recognoscendum super sacramentum suum si predicti Henricus et Nicholaus abbettauerunt predictum Willelmum indictari de pluribus latrociniiis homicidiis et receptamentis Ricardi et Radulfi fratrum suorum postquam vtlagati fuerunt, sicut predictus Willelmus dicit, vel non, sicut predicti Henricus et Nicholaus dicunt. Quia tam predicti etc. Et tu ipse tunc sis ibi audiendo iudicium tuum de hoc quod preceptum prius inde tibi directum non est executum. Et habeas ibi etc. Teste Radulfo de Hengham etc. xxij. die Aprilis anno xvj°.'

Ad quem diem venire fecit vicecomes Bedfordie xxvj. procuratos per Radulfum de Bello Campo qui fuerunt tenentes sui pro parte. Quo testificatum fuit quod predicti Henricus et Nicholaus recesserunt sine die in quindena sancte Trinitatis. Per quod preceptum fuit iuratoribus quod seruarent diem suum a die sancti Michaelis in tres septimanas. Vnde tale breue exit :

‘Edwardus etc. vicecomiti Bedfordie salutem. Precipimus tibi quod distringas tot et tales scilicet xxv. recognitores iuratos summonitos in curia nostra coram nobis inter Willelmum filium Hugonis quondam persone etc. Henricum de la Leye et Nicholaum de Cernes de quadam transgressione eidem Willelmo per predictum Henricum et Nicholaum illata, vt dicitur, per omnes terras et catalla sua etc. Ita quod nec ipsi nec aliquis per ipsos etc. donec etc. Et quod de exitibus etc. Et quod habeas corpora eorum coram nobis vel locum nostrum tenentibus a die sancti Michaelis in tres septimanas vbi-cumque etc. ad faciendum iuratum illam et ad audiendum iudicium suum de pluribus defaltis. Et premunire facias predictos Henricum et Nicholaum quod tunc sint ibi audiendo illam recognicionem si voluerint. Et habeas ibi hoc breue. Teste W. de Saham apud Westmonasterium xiiij. die Iunii anno xvjo.’

Ad quem diem predicti Henricus et Nicholaus inuenti fuerunt in aula apud Westmonasterium, qui tunc temporis circa negocia sua propria vacabant et ducti fuerunt coram iusticiariis et oppositum fuit eis de abbetto predicto : qui petierunt iudicium si deberent respondere predicto Willelmo desicut recesserunt si[ne] die et quieti de placito illo in quindena sancte Trinitatis : et super hoc vocauerunt ad warantum irrotulamentum super hoc factum et adhuc vocarent [sed] rotulus ille in fideli custodia moraretur : et nichilominus calampniauerunt iuratores pro eo quod fuerunt tenentes predicti Radulfi de Bello [Campo] qui fuit manutentor predicti Willelmi, et in vnamquamque personam bonam calumpniam inuenerunt : nec per hoc auditi fuerunt set propter hoc [sententia] illa contra eos preteriiuit per quod adiudicati fuerunt prisone in qua ferris erant mancipati et in loco vili positi. Et vnde [queruntur] quod incarcerati fuerunt apud Bassingeshawe¹ per xij. dies et per xvij. dies apud Flete et Neugate. Et interim taxata eisdem [dampna ejusdem] Willelmi per iusticiarios versus Henricum ad xxx. marcas et versus Regem amerciatus fuit ad alias triginta marcas, et ne in carcere mortuus fuisset [eas solvit]. Et dampna sua versus Nicholaum taxata fuerant ad x. marcas de quibus pacatus est. Et vnde exiit breue ad leuandum de [bonis et catallis Henrici] ad opus predicti Willelmi xxx. marcas vel catalla ad valenciam tanti. Per quod breue vicecomes liberauit ei viginti et tria cas et alia aueria in precium lxvij. s. vij. d. et lxij. oues in precium ciiij. s. vij. d. Et preterea vend[ita] per manum eiusdem

Membrane
much torn.

¹ Basinghall.

Henrici in precium xvij. marcarum preter quarterii xxij. d., que quidem catalla apreciata fuerunt per Radulfum [de Hengham et socios] suos ad dampnum ipsius Henrici etc. Et preterea ad aurum Regine soluit quadraginta solidos ad d[ampnum etc.].

Idem Nicholaus queritur de Willelmo de Brumpton quod iniuste fecit ipsum inprisonari apud Neugate in prof[undo carcere ad instanciam] Abbatis de Stratforde¹ et propter munera sua : et ibi detentus fuit nec exire potuit quousque concesserat quod Abbas [haberet molendina in] villa de Temesforde ; que quidem molendina idem Nicholaus de predicto Abbate coram I. de Vallibus et s[ociis] suis in ultimo itinere in comitatu] Bedfordie vt ius suum recuperavit. Et vnde queritur quod idem Abbas per consilium predicti Willelmi venit apud Neugate et f[ecit] eum in carcere] profundo tractari, presente predicto Willelmo, et ibi allocutus fuit predictum Nicholaum, et petit ab eo si predicta molendina ei [concederet, et] predictus Nicholaus ea ei concessit metu maioris pene in prisiona et ad hoc fecit ipsum Abbas affidare quod [coram] Radulfo de Hengham faceret recognitionem. Et vnde in crastina die ductus fuit coram iusticiariis per preceptum predicti Willelmi [et] liberatus fuit a ferris, et inde fecit recognitionem : ad dampnum etc.

Membrane
much torn.

Ad querelam Henrici de la Leghe respondit Willelmus de Brumpton quod ubi predictus Henricus queritur quod ipse per abbetum et favorem predicti Willelmi inprisonatus fuit primo in custodia marescalli et postea in gaola pontis de Flete, respondit Willelmus quod si idem Henricus per prisionam vel aliquo alio modo grauatus fuit hoc non fuit per ipsum Willelmum i[mm]o pro eo quod idem Henricus accusatus fuit coram Radulfo de Hengham et sociis suis de falso abbetto ; per quod quidem abbetum [Ricar]d[us] de Temesforde ad procuracionem ipsius Henrici, prout coram predicto Radulfo et sociis suis conuictum² fuit, arestatus fuit et postea per [finem li]beratus coram prefato Radulfo et sociis suis, prout predictus Radulfus qui presens est recordatur. Et similiter predictam arestacionem Bedford predicto conuictus fuit prout ipse Henricus dicit et in petitione [sua asserit].

Brumpton.

Membrane
much torn.

¹ Stratford at Bow, Cistercian abbey in Essex.

² MS. convinctum.

m. 15.

Et Willelmus de Saham dicit quoad hoc quod predicti Henricus et Nicholaus testificantur ipsum reddidisse predictum iudicium et predictum breue consignasse, quod bene credit quod ipse iudicium illud reddidit et quoad consignacionem predicti breuis dicit quod si per inspeccionem rotulorum constare poterit quod in rotulis illis contineatur warantum per quod predictum breue exire debuit, bene aduocat predictum breue et eius consignacionem. Et si nullum warantum inde in rotulis inueniatur, dicit quod breue illud per ipsum aut preceptum suum nunquam fuit factum aut ipso sciente consignatum, immo per deceptionem et maliciam clericorum qui tunc temporis ad breuia custodienda in banco illo et ad breuia de iudicio examinanda et sigillanda deputati fuerunt, et hoc paratus est verificare prout curia consideret, et petit iudicium etc.

Et Henricus et Nicholaus dicunt quod predictus Willelmus ad predictum breue deaduocandum audiri non debet. Dicunt enim quod idem Willelmus alias coram auditoribus in curia ista hic in quadam querela sua propria versus Iohannem de Caue facta tam predictum breue quam predictum iudicium et eius consignacionem aduocauit, prout curia ista bene verificare poterit tam per inspeccionem predictae querele quam per recordum rotulorum et auditorum tunc temporis presencium super quorum recordam iidem Henricus et Nicholaus se ponunt. Et petunt iudicium etc. Et auditores hoc idem recordantur. Et super hoc dies datus est eis de audiendo iudicio suo hic in crastino Assencionis Domini. Et idem dies datus est Radulfo de Hengham et Iohanni de Caue et predictis Henrico et Nicholao de audiendo iudicio suo de dampnis que petunt versus predictos iusticiarios.

Postea in crastino Assencionis Domini veniunt predicti Henricus et Nicholaus et instantiter petunt dampna sua versus predictos Radulfum de Hengham, Iohannem de Caue, Willelmum de Brumpton et Willelmum de Saham etc.

Et quoad dampna que predicti Henricus et Nicholaus petunt de predicto Willelmo de Brumpton et aliis, dicunt quod cum Willelmus de Temesforde diem habeat in aduentu iusticiariorum vel alias que Regi placuerit ad purgandum se per patriam de receptamento fratrum suorum vtlagatorum, de quo indietatus fuit coram vicecomite Bedfordie in turno suo, videtur de iure quod dampna predictorum [Henrici et] Nicholai non debent taxari nec

adiudicari antequam processus et tractatus¹ super dilacione Willelmi de Temesforde plene determine[n]tur: poterit enim contingere quod predictus [Willelmus ponat] se per patriam, et post purgacionem petat inquiri de abbettatoribus, et forte inueniri poterit et conuinci quod predicti Henricus et Nicholaus fuerint abbetta[tores per mali]ciam: quibus conuictis si ita sit, oportebit pronunciari quod predicti Henricus et Nicholaus iuste fuerunt inprisonati, iuste redempti et iuste reddiderunt dampna et sic . . iniusta fuit eorum secta versus iusticiarios, nec debent de sua iniusta secta per iudicium conuicta dampna recuperare aut emolumentum reportare. Et si visum fuerit auditoribus quod iustum sit quod ante vel post vel aliquo tempore dampna recuperent: prospiciant auditores denarios, habentes pre oculis quod illi solummodo dampna intrarent et ad dampna teneantur qui se dampnum fecisse cognouerunt. Nec sunt nec debent auditores esse immemores de recognicione quam Willelmus de Saham fecit die Veneris in crastino sancti Andree Apostoli tam oretenus quam per billam etc. Et datus est dies predictis iusticiariis et Henrico et Nicholao vsque a die sancti Iohannis Baptiste in xv. dies. Ad quem diem venerunt predicti iusticiarii et Henricus et Nicholaus. Et datus est eis dies vsque in crastinum Animarum etc.

Et Radulfus venit et dicit quod vbi predicti Henricus et Nicholaus queruntur quod predictus Radulfus fecit exire breue de M. 16 a. capiendi Henricum et Nicholaum antequam compertum esset per patriam quod fuissent abbettatores, prout patet per datam breuium, que est per quatuor dies antecedens diem qua inquisicio transisse debuerat: Respondit Radulfus quod breuia nunquam facta erant quousque capta esset inquisicio, set si clerici ignorabant de ponendo rectam datam, propter hoc non fuerunt breuia viciosa, quia in cancellaria et alibi in vno et eodem die vnus clericus ponit vnam datam et alius aliam, set certum est quod breuia non exierunt antequam inquisicio capta et preterita fuisset. Et vbi conqueruntur quod a die Pasche in tres septimanas, quando coronatores et xxv. alii milites et legales veniunt ad veritatem dicendam de abbetto: et quod Radulfus noluit aliquam veritatem per eos inquirere, immo permisit quod per vnicam solam calumpniam quam idem Willelmus calumpniavit dicendo quod omnes fuerunt procurati, absque assignando certam calumpniam contra quamlibet

¹ MS. tractatus.

personam, omnes ammouit et precepit venire alios iuratores ad quindenam sancte Trinitatis: respondit Radulfus et bene hoc aduocat quia testificatum erat quod omnes iuratores venerunt in societate predictorum Henrici et Nicholai ad eorum custus, et ad eorum custus moram traxerunt in villa, per quod videbatur ei quod magis valeret eos amouere quam per eos aliquam veritatem inquirere. Et hoc potuit facere de iure ex quo nullus per talem amocionem neque Rex nec aliquis alius dampnum habere potuit nisi tantummodo dilacionem vnus diei. Et vbi conqueruntur quod cum recesserunt quieti per non sectam ipsius Willelmi ad quindenam sancte Trinitatis de quo fuit iudicium irrotulatum, fuit idem irrotulamentum postea rasum et adnullatum, et totum iudicium quod pro eis habuerunt demptum et aliud irrotulamentum quale continetur in quodam scrowetto insertum: respondit Radulfus quod de rastura illa nichil sciuit de hoc quod dicunt quod breue exiit sub testimonio domini W. de Saham de faciendo venire inquisitionem a die sancti Michaelis in tres septimanas sancti Michaelis proxime sequentes. Respondit Radulfus quod de breui illo non habet respondere, set respondeat ille qui breue illud sigillauit. Ad hoc quod dicunt quod a die sancti Michaelis in tres septimanas venissent ipsi et allegassent pro se quod alias recesserunt quieti per non sectam ipsius Willelmi, quod non fuit eis allocatum: et quod calumpniauerunt iuratores per certas et rationabiles causas, videlicet quod fuerunt homines Radulfi de Bello Campo qui totum factum procurauit contra eos, nec fuit eorum calumpnia allocata: et quod capta fuit inquisicio per emulos et homines supradictos et tenentes predicti Radulfi per quorum dictum liberati fuerunt prisone et redempti: respondit Radulfus quod de aliquo facto in banco eo die quo transiuit illa inquisicio, non habet necesse respondere, eo quod tunc absens fuit. Et de hoc ponit se super veredictum predictorum Henrici et Nicholai, qui postea bene testificantur quod predictus Radulfus tunc non fuit presens: immo dicunt quod quicquid factum fuit eo die contra eos fuit factum Willelmi de Saham et magistri Thome de Sudyngtone: quod Willelmus de Saham dedicere non potuit.

Postea in parlamento domini Regis quod tenuit post Natale coram ipso Rege et consilio suo, quia predictus Radulfus qui presens fuit non potuit dedicere quin sigillauit breuia per que preceptum fuit vicecomiti quod caperet predictos Henricum et Nicholaum, nec potuit dedicere quin datum illorum breuium pre-

cessit capcionem inquisitionis per quam indictati fuerunt, nec compertum fuit per rotulos quod predicti Henricus et Nicholaus fuerunt per aliquam inquisitionem accusati nec eciam predictus Willelmus de Temesforde de predicto receptamento aquietatus, videbatur Regi et eius consilio quod preceptum cap[ere] non capiendum: propter quod consideratum fuit quod predictus Radulfus sit ad voluntatem domini Regis et remaneret in custodia Thesaurarii quousque sciatur de voluntate domini Regis. Et quod predicti recordum et processus adnullentur et pro nullo habeantur etc.

Custodie.

Postea predicti Radulfus et socii sui iusticiarii de banco Regis finem fecerunt prout patet in quadam cedula huic rotulo attachiata.¹ Postea coram auditoribus venerunt predicti Henricus et Nicholaus et dixerunt quod per hoc quod error compertus fuit in processu iusticiariorum, propter quod irritari debet et adnichilari quicquid predicti iusticiarii fecerunt post errorem suum: Et desicut post errorem compertum adiudicati fuerunt prisone et dampna fuerunt predicto Willelmo de Themisforde adiudicata que per rigorem iudicii illius eidem Willelmo soluerunt, videlicet predictus Henricus viginti libras et predictus Nicholaus decem marcas: petunt quod desicut iudicium illud adnullatur quod quicquid per illud iudicium subsecutum adnullatur et per consequens dampna que soluerunt eis restituantur: et similiter quicquid domino Regi soluerunt nomine redempcionis vel misericordie. Et quia coram domino Rege et eius consilio irritatum fuit factum predictorum iusticiariorum, visum fuit auditoribus quod quicquid factum fuit per ipsos in predicto processu venire debet in reuersionem, et adiudicauerunt dampna que predicti Henricus et Nicholaus soluerunt predicto Willelmo eis restitui. Et predicti Henricus et Nicholaus, quesiti vtrum sequi voluerint breue de iudicio quod vicecomes fieri faciat predicta dampna de terris et catallis ipsius Willelmi vel quod vicecomes liberet eis medietatem terrarum ipsius Willelmi secundum quod huius eleccio concedatur per vltimum statutum Westmonasterii illis qui debita aut dampna in curia Regis recuperauerunt,² dicunt quod predictus Willelmus non habet mobilia que sufficiunt ad tanta dampna, petunt quod liberetur eis terra predicti Willelmi per rationabilem extentam tenenda per formam statuti quousque perceperint ad valenciam predictorum dampnorum: et conceditur eis. Et preceptum est vicecomiti quod liberari faciat predicto

¹ The schedule is printed in the text at the end of this case (page 39).

² Stat. Westminster II. (1285), cap. xviii., *Statutes of the Realm* i. 82.

Henrico, qui plus soluit pro dampnis, medietatem terre predicti Willelmi, et predicto Nicholao medietatem alterius medietatis tenendam per predictum statutum in forma predicta. Et quia indictamentum per quod predictus Willelmus indic[tatus est factum] est sub sigillo indictancium, nec inuenitur in rotulis iusticiariorum quod predictus Willelmus acquietatus fuit per patriam [videtur] auditoribus quod cum indictamentum illud venisset coram tenentibus locum domini Regis qui maiores fuerunt . . . quam alii iusticarii et factum predictorum locum Regis tenencium est iam coram eis discussum et determinatum quod merito [debet iustitia] illius indictamenti per ipsos discuti et determinari. Propter quod preceptum est vicecomiti quod venire faciat apud Westmonasterium coram auditoribus die Sabbati proxima post festum sancti Nicholai (qui quidem dies datus est predicto Willelmo qui arestatus fuit per auditores et manucaptus sicut patet per [billam]) xxiiij. tam milites etc. per quos etc. et qui nec etc. ad recognoscendum vtrum predictus Willelmus culpabilis sit de receptamento fratris sui vtlagati sicut indictatus est inde, vel non. Et dictum est predictis Henrico et Nicholao qui alias prouiti fuerunt pro abbettamento illius indictamenti quod tunc sint ibi calumpniaturi pro Rege iuratores si qui fuerunt inutiles vel suspecti. Ad quem diem predictus Willelmus venit et xxiiij. tam milites etc. et quia auditores non fuerunt in curia tunc nisi tantum W. le Latymer, per consilium Thesaurarii et baronum de scaccario preceptum est predictis xxiiij. quod eant domi. Et preceptum est vicecomiti sicut prius quod venire faciat hic a die sancti Hillarii in xv. dies xxiiij. tam milites etc. de visneto et de propinquiioribus de Bereforde et Temesforde per quos etc. Et qui nec etc. ad certificandum etc. Et datus est dies prefato Willelmo ad prefatum terminum et est sub priori manucapcione etc. Postea ad predictum diem veniunt iuratores et predictus Willelmus. Et quia comes Lincolnie tunc fuit in partibus transmarinis in negociis domini Regis, et Iohannes de sancto Iohanne similiter [nec] fuit ibi aliquis auditorum qui in huiusmodi placito posset cognoscere quia tangit coronam preter Willelmum le Latymer tantum, [man]datum est per auditores et iusticiarios quod predicti iuratores redeant in partes suas. Et predictus Willelmus habeat breue de cancellaria dirigendum vicecomiti Bedfordie [ut inueniat] de eo sufficientem manucapcionem ad standum recto ad primam deliberacionem gayole vel in aduentu iusticiariorum.

[Item Nicholaus] et Henricus queruntur de Willelmo de Brumptone quod idem Willelmus per litteras suas et mandata directa vicecomiti Bedfordie . . . [in] quadam inquisicione de abbetto coram R. de Hengham capta inter Willelmum de Temesforde et predictos Henricum et Nicholaum [fecit iuratores quo]s voluit, qui quidem iuratores sumptibus et expensis predicti Willelmi de Brumptone venerunt apud Londoniam et ibi dixerunt contra ipsos Henricum [et Nicholaum], videlicet quod per abbetum ipsorum fuit predictus Willelmus de Temesforde indictatus de receptamentis supradictis: per quod ipsi Henricus [et Nicholaus] dampnati erant et inprisonati ad dampnum ipsorum centum librarum etc.

[Et Wille]lmus venit et dicit quod nullus minister Regis per procuracionem alterius compelli potest ad aliud faciendum quam ad officium suum pertinet, vnde dicit quod omnes iuratores predicti venerunt per breue domini Regis et per vicecomitem et non per ipsum, et dicit quod iuratores predictos per dona aut iocalia aut [munera] aut exhibicionem non procuravit pro commodo suo aut aliqua valitate que ei inde accidere posset ad iniustum grauamen [eisdem] Henrico et Nicholao inferendum. Paratus est verificare prout curia consideret tam per iuratores ipsos prius super hoc iuratos qui factum suum [approb]averunt quam per alios liberos et legales homines de comitatu Bedfordie neutri parti suspectos: et predicti Henricus et Nicholaus similiter. Ideo preceptum [est vicecomiti] quod venire faciat hic in octabis sancti Iohannis Baptiste xxiiij. etc. de visneto de Temesforde per quos etc. et qui nec etc. ad [recog]noscendum etc. quia tam etc. Postea a die sancti Iohannis Baptiste in xv. dies anno vicesimo veniunt predicti Henricus de la Leghe et Nicholaus de Cernes per Thomam le Socke attornatum suum: et predictus Willelmus de Brumptone et iuratores similiter. Et predicti Henricus et Nicholaus per [eundem] Thomam attornatum suum retraxerunt se versus predictum Willelmum. Ideo consideratum est quod predictus Willelmus eat inde quietus et predicti Henricus et Nicholaus in misericordia.

Postea Radulfus de Hengham finem fecit cum domino Rege pro Cedula. predicta transgressione et omnibus aliis transgressionibus, prout patet per litteram domini Regis patentem ¹ quam penes se habet, per viij^m. marcas, et Willelmus de Saham per ij^m. marcas, et Nicholaus

¹ The patent of Hengham's pardon is dated 11 Feb., 1291; *Cal. Patent Rolls, Edward I.*, 1281-1292, p. 421.

de Stapeltone per ij^m. marcas, et Walterus de Hoptone per D. marcas. Et inde inuenerunt plegios sufficientes quorum nomina remanent penes magistrum Willelmum de Marchia thesaurarium domini Regis. Et sciendum quod extracte de predictis finibus facte sunt et liberate in scaccario per manus Petri de Leycestria.

8a

Defendant.—John de Cave, clerk to Ralph de Hengham.

Complainant.—William de Saham.

Reference to manuscript.—B., Membrane 21.

No other references.

Number of case in Appendix III., 63.

Bedeford.
m. 21.

Willelmus de Saham queritur domino Rege et eius consilio de Iohanne de Caue dum idem Iohannes fuit clericus Radulfi de Hengham et idem Willelmus de Saham socius ipsius Radulfi in banco domini Regis apud Westmonasterium vbi quidam Henricus de la Leye et Nicholaus de Cernes recessi fuerunt sine die versus quemdam Willelmum de Temesforde coram eis per non prosecutionem ipsius Willelmi de Temesforde in vno placito transgressionis et abbetti in comitatu Bedfordie ad quindenam sancte Trinitatis anno regni regis nunc sextodecimo: ibi venit predictus Iohannes per illud inrotulamentum mutandum de predicta quindena sancte Trinitatis vsque ad diem sancte Trinitatis in tres septimanas; et postquam iidem Henricus et Nicholaus per iudicium sic recessi fuerunt predictus Iohannes de Caue pro quinque marcis quas recepit de predicto Willelmo de Temesforde misit quoddam breue domini Regis sub testimonio predicti Radulfi de Hengham vicecomiti Bedfordie, et venire fecit infra octo dies predictos viginti quatuor in illa inquisitione a die sancte Trinitatis in tres septimanas. Set sicut placuit Deo quidam bonus homo qui fuit in curia quando predicti Henricus et Nicholaus recesserunt sine die, dixit predicto Radulfo de Hengham coram omnibus quod non debuit inde inquisitionem capere pro eo quod recessi fuerunt sine die. Unde predictus Radulfus supersedit, et Willelmus de Brumpton qui sedebat iuxta eum fere misit predictum hominem pro dicto suo ad prisonam. Et cito post predictus Iohannes de Caue per inrotulamentum mutatum, fecit quoddam aliud breue de faciendo

venire illam inquisitionem a die sancti Michaelis in tres septimanas, quod quidem breue idem Willelmus sigillasse dubitabat, quia ipsum in predicto breue posuit testem et breue illud tradidit in manus ipsius Willelmi de Saham ad sigillandum, quia predictus Radulfus dominus suus absens fuit per ordinacionem domini Regis: per quod breue, si illud sigillasset, vicecomes Bedfordie venire fecit illam inquisitionem a die sancti Michaelis in tres septimanas. Quam inquisitionem ipse Willelmus de Saham et Walterus de Winburne socius suus simul cum magistro Thoma de Sodingtone ceperunt, qui nichil sciuerunt quod Willelmus de Brumpton et quidem Radulfus de Bello Campo miles fouebant partem predicti Willelmi de Themesforde, per cuius Radulfi de Bello Campo tenentes maxima pars inquisitionis illius fuit. Et vbi predicti Henrici et Nicholaus illos calumpniarunt per bonam racionem, quia fuerunt homines predicti Radulfi de Bello Campo fouentis partem aduersam simul cum predicto Willelmo de Brumpton qui totum composuit, ordinauit, et fouebat, predicti Willelmus de Saham et Walterus de Winburne predictas calumpnias non allocarunt nec allocare debuerunt, prout eis videbatur quia predictus Radulfus de Bello Campo non fuit nominatus in breui, nec querens fuit in illa querela. Et in tanto decepti et seducti fuerunt per Willelmum de Brumpton et Iohannem de Caue. Vnde idem Willelmus est in graui forisfactura versus dominum Regem et pudoriter defamatus. Et petit quod super hoc audiat modo et coram domino Rege, quia paratus est ad hoc verificandum etc.

Et Willelmus de Brumpton venit et dicit quod vbi Willelmus de Saham inponit ei sedicionem factam per ipsum Willelmum de Brumpton in processu loquele que fuit coram iusticiariis de Banco Regis, vbi ipse Willelmus de Saham fuit vnus sociorum, inter Willelmum de Themesforde querentem et Henricum de la Leye et Nicholaum de Cernes per rasturam rotulorum et alias transgressionis contentas in petitione et querela ipsius Willelmi de Saham quas offert verificare, quod idem Willelmus de Saham imponendo sedicionem, salua pace et reuerencia auditorum, mentitur. Dicit eciam idem Willelmus de Brumpton quod Willelmus de Saham nullam sedicionem ei imponere potest cum ipse Willelmus de Brumpton numquam ipsius Willelmi de Saham familiaris socius fuisset aut specialis ei aliquo modo attingens: nec idem Willelmus de Brumpton fuit aliquo modo de placea illa vbi predicta sedicio facta fuisse dicitur, per ipsum W. de Saham tamen et non per

aliquem alium. Dicit eciam idem Willelmus de Brumptonē quod, si aliqua sedicio alia vel transgressio facta fuit in premissis, facta fuit extraneis qui habent accionem et non ipsi Willelmo de Saham. Dicit eciam idem Willelmus de Brumptonē quod ex quo idem Willelmus de Saham plene cognoscit per petitionem suam quod predicti Henricus et Nicholaus ad certum diem in quindena sancte Trinitatis anno sextodecimo recesserunt sine die in querela predicta per iudicium ore suo prolatum, et non potest dedicere quin ipsemet postea continuauit predictam loquelam et cepit inde inquisicionem per homines domini Radulfi de Bello Campo calumpniatos et non purgatos per quam ipsi Henricus et Nicholaus dampnati fuerunt, unde ipse Willelmus de Saham in hoc se confitetur reum totius criminis de quo nullum appellare potest nisi tanquam latro, suum cognoscens latrocinium et alios de societate appellans. Unde idem Willelmus de Brumptonē petit iudicium si appellum de sedicione modo iaceat aut competat ipsi Willelmo de Saham. Et hiis ipsi Willelmo de Brumptonē allocatis et habitis, super hiis inde paratus est vltius respondere quatenus curia considerauerit tanquam clericus.

Caue. Et Iohannes de Caue venit et primo et principaliter petit quod idem Willelmus de Saham declaret sibi querelam suam. Videlicet vbi dicit quod predicti Henricus et Nicholaus per iudicium recesserunt sine die a die sancte Trinitatis in quindecim dies anno xvj., quod dicat per cuius iudicium sic recesserunt sine die et quis reddidit iudicium illud. Qui quidem Willelmus dicit quod ipsemet reddidit iudicium per quod sic recesserunt sine die etc. Et quoad ¹ breue de iudicio faciendo venire predictam inquisicionem infra octo dies post predictam quindenam sancte Trinitatis sub testimonio predicti Radulfi de Hengham, petit predictus Iohannes quod Radulfus respondeat de breui suo; qui venit et dicit quod predictus Willelmus in hoc minus bene dicit et in hoc ponit se super data breuis: quo scrutato, compertum est quod data illius breuis per quam inquisicio venit a die sancte Trinitatis in tres septimanas excessit diem quindene predictę per quinque septimanas et amplius, et est data illius breuis xxiiij. die Aprilis anno xvj^o. sicut patet per transcriptum illius breuis hic attachiatum.² Et preterea idem Iohannes petit quod idem Willelmus declaret vltius querelam suam, videlicet vbi dicit quod idem Iohannes fecisse debuit quoddam

¹ MS. ex ad quo ad.

² The writ is printed in the text at the end of this case (p. 45).

breue de iudicio sub testimonio ipsius Willelmi de faciendo venire predictam inquisitionem a die sancti Michaelis in tres septimanas, per quod breue si illud sigillasset, vicecomes Bedfordie venire fecit predictam inquisitionem ad prefatum terminum. Et petit quod dicat utrum illud sigillauit vel non: quod si nunquam fuit sigillatum per illud breue nullum malum factum fuit. Qui quidem Willelmus dicit quod idem Iohannes breue id fecit et seductiue in manu sua posuit ad sigillandum; qui illud breue sic sigillauit etc. et hoc paratus est verificare sicut curia considerauerit. Et Iohannes de Caue defendit vim et iniuriam, omnem mutationem cuiuslibet inrotulamenti, omnem facturam cuiuslibet falsi breuis, omnem receptionem et deceptionem et quicquid est contra coronam vel dignitatem domini Regis, omnem positionem seu tradicionem cuiuslibet falsi breuis in manu predicti Willelmi ad sigillandum: vbi et quando etc. et paratus est defendere contra predictum Willelmum per corpus suum, vt persona et capellanus, vel sicut curia considerauerit etc. Et quia querela ista tangit deceptionem et seductionem, dictum est predicto Willelmo quod inueniat plegios ad sequendum querelam suam ad faciendum quod curia considerauerit: qui inuenit prout continetur in cedula inde confecta in ligula posita. Et similiter dictum est predicto Iohanni quod inueniat plegios ad se defendendum et faciendum quod curia considerauerit: qui similiter inuenit sex plegios, et datus est eis dies vsque in crastinum, videlicet diem Veneris proxima post festum sancti Andree Apostoli. Ad quem diem venerunt tam predictus Willelmus quam predictus Iohannes, et Iohannes vt prius paratus fuit per corpus suum defendere contra predictum Willelmum omnem deceptionem seductionem transgressionem et quicquid fuit contra pacem et dignitatem domini Regis, et optulit vadium suum in manibus comitis Lincolnie, et recipitur per plegiacionem predictam.

Et dictum est predicto Willelmo quod faciat quod de iure facere debet versus predictum Iohannem. Qui dicit quod non vult sequi versus eum per verba felonie, immo in forma transgressionis. Et Iohannes de Caue dicit quod cum predictus Willelmus de Saham imposuisset sibi falsitatem deceptionem et seductionem per querelam in scriptis et per os suum proprium, et idem Iohannes quicquid sibi imponitur paratus fuit et est contra predictum Willelmum per corpus suum defendere, et ad se defendendum

securitatem inuenisset predictus Willelmus per medium oris sui proprii, postquam inuenit plegios de querela sua proseguenda et ulterius faciendo quod iustum esset in querela sua, dixit coram vobis auditoribus qui recordum habetis et representatis personam domini Regis, quod non vult sequi querelam suam per verba felonie, immo in forma transgressionis, nec resortiri potest nec debet de hoc quod per os suum dixit coram vobis qui recordum habetis. Sic petit idem Iohannes de Caue iudicium primo de predicto Willelmo tanquam de eo qui defecit in secta et improbatione sua per recognitionem suam propriam, nec resortiri potest nec debet ad aliquam querelam transgressionis de articulis predictis de quibus questus fuit coram vobis per verba felonie, desicut quodlibet appellum de feloniam et seduccione sit de tam alta natura quod postquam appellum factum fuerit et ad appellum responsum, nullus respondere debet nec tenetur per placitum transgressionis, quod est inferioris nature quam sit eius appellum, de rebus vnde appellatus est vel fuit, vnde precise petit iudicium etc. Preterea precise petit iudicium desicut predictus Willelmus per recognitionem suam propriam retraxit se de querela sua super ipsum Iohannem facta per verba felonie et etiam recognouerit per os suum in iudicio quod ipse Willelmus de Saham reddidit iudicium per quod predicti Henricus de la Leye et Nicholaus de Cernes sine die recesserunt ad quindenam sancte Trinitatis anno xvj., et postea recognovit quod contra illud iudicium sigillauit predictum breue de iudicio inter eos et aduersarium suum de faciendo venire predictam inquisitionem a die sancti Michaelis in tres septimanas, et tunc inquisitionem illam cepit contra factum suum proprium, quod quidem factum bene scire debuit; petit idem Iohannes de Caue iudicium de predicto Willelmo de Saham tanquam de eo qui decepit curiam domini Regis per factum suum; per quod quidem factum multi b[oni homines] habent maximum dampnum et pudorem adeo bene predicti Henricus et Nicholaus quam alii, ad dampnum ipsius Iohannis de Caue mil[le librarum]; vnde precise petit iudicium etc. Dies datus est eis de audiendo iudicio suo a die sancti Hillarii in quindecim dies [coram audi]toribus domini Regis apud Westmonasterium. Postea ad diem illum venerunt partes et predictus Iohannes petit iudicium suum vt supra. E[t Willelmus] de Saham, requisitus per Episcopum Wintoniensem Willelmum le Latimer et alios auditores domini Regis, si velit sequi versus predictum [Iohannem] de Caue: qui sepius dixit quod non

vult sequi versus eum nec versus aliquem alium, set omnino se retraxit de querela sua. Et s[ic] consideratum est] quod predictus Iohannes eat inde sine die et ad iudicium quoad predictum Willelmum et dictum est ei quod non exeat villam habuerit in mandatis. Et predictus Willelmus de Saham per auditores requisitus si velit sequi versus Willelmum de Brumpton . . . [dixit] quod non, set omnino se retraxit de predicta querela. Ideo consideratum est quod predictus Willelmus de Brumpton eat [inde sine die et ad iudicium] quoad predictum Willelmum de Saham.

‘Edwardus Dei gracia Rex Anglie dominus Hibernie et Dux Aquitanie vicecomiti Bedfordie salutem. Q[ua] iuratores cuiusdam inquisicionis inter Willelmum filium Hugonis quondam] persone ecclesie de Temesforde querentem et Henricum de la Leye et Nicholaum de Cernes de placito transgressionis [minus fuerunt sufficientes suspecti et calumpniati, tibi] precipimus quod amotis omnibus illis, scilicet Roberto le Crevequer, Galfrido Rolaunde, Willelmo le Harper, Hugone de Oylde[oeuf, Hugone le Blont, Thoma] cum Barba, Simone le Fraunkeleyn, Alaric de Lundres, Iohanne filio Iohannis de Colmorde, Willelmo Thyuille, Iohanne le Iouene [Willelmo Mordant, Willelmo] Boynon, Ricardo de Blenes, Iohanne de Exemouthe, Willelmo le Child, Henrico de Dylewyke, Henrico de Flamuille, Ricardo M[al]erbe, W[illelmo] de Haspey], Iohanne Chann, Willelmo Maunsel, Ricardo Aundreu, Roberto le Cite, et Simone le Chann, et loco eorum venire facias coram nobis vel locum nostrum tenentibus a die sancte Trinitatis in tres septimanas vbicumque tunc fuerimus vel fuerint in Anglia xxiiij. milites et legales homines de visneto de Temesforde [per] quos rei veritas melius sciri poterit, et qui nec predictum Willelmum nec predictos Henricum et Nicholaum aliqua affinitate attingant, ad recognoscendum super sacramentum suum si predicti Henricus et Nicholaus abbettauerunt predictum Willelmum indictari de pluribus latrocinis, homicidiis et receptamento Ricardi et Radulfi fratrum suorum [postquam] vtlagati fuerunt sicut predictus Willelmus dicit, vel omnino sicut predicti Henricus et Nicholaus dicunt. Quia tam predicti Henricus et Nicholaus quam predictus Willelmus inter quos inde contencio est, posuerunt se in inquisicionem illam. Et tu ipse tunc sis ibi auditurus iudicium tuum de hoc quod preceptum nostrum prius inde tibi directum non est executum. Et habeas ibi nomina iuratorum et hoc breue. Teste Radulfo de Hengham apud Westmonasterium xxiiij die Aprilis anno xvj.’

Cedula.

9

Defendant.—Ralph de Hengham, chief justice of King's Bench.

Complainant.—William de Camville.

Reference to manuscript.—B., Membrane 14.

No other references.

Number of case in Appendix III., 96.

Hibernia.
m. 14,

Willelmus de Kanuile mercator Bristollie queritur de domino Radulfo de Hengham de eo quod cum predictus Willelmus tulisset recordum et processum cuiusdam falsi iudicii redditi in ciuitate de Diuelyna¹ coram maiore et ballivis et communitate predictae ciuitatis, et illud recordum et processum sub sigillo capitalis iusticiarii de Hibernia predicto Radulfo tulisset, vt predicto Willelmo super predictis recordo et processu iusticiam exhiberet: et similiter venire fecit Adam Hundrede et Willelmum de Beuerlaco² tunc ballivos de Dyuelina per breue iusticiariorum de Dyuelina coram predicto Radulfo ad audiendum iudicium suum de recordo et processu predicto: idem Radulfus predictum Willelmum coram ipso audire noluit, set ipsum fugauit de banco et fugare fecit et ei minabatur quod si vnquam postea predictos recordum et processum predicti falsi iudicii [proferret] quod ipsum inprisonari faceret per vnum annum et vnum diem vbi nec videret manum nec pedem. Istam iniuriam fecit sibi predictus Radulfus ad dampnum ipsius Willelmi etc.

Item idem Willelmus queritur de eodem Radulfo de eo quod vbi idem Willelmus optulit se versus Adam Hundred et petiit iudicium reddi secundum recordum et processum predicti falsi iudicii in predicta curia redditi, sicut preceptum domini Regis voluit, ibi precepit predictus Radulfus eidem Willelmo quod de nouo narraret versus atornatum Ade Hundred aduersarii sui: vt sic ipsum Willelmum impediret iniuste ne aliquid recuperaret versus prefatam curiam de Diuelina occasione predicti falsi iudicii et ne predicta curia libertatem suam perderet. Et quod predictus Radulfus sic fecit, idem Willelmus vocat rotulos predicti Radulfi de termino Pasche anno regni regis Edwardi xviij^o etc.

¹ Dublin. For Camville's Irish suits see *Cal. Documents relating to Ireland*, 1285–1292, especially nos. 460, 479, and 523.

² Beverley.

Item idem Willelmus queritur de predicto Radulfo de eo quod cum predictus Adam Hundred conuictus fuit in banco coram eodem Radulfo tamquam pro indefenso et super hoc exiuit breue eiusdem Radulfi de iudicio capitalis iusticiarii de Hibernia ad deliberandum predicto Willelmo quadraginta libras et vnam marcā in custodia predicti iusticiarii de Hibernia existentes : et ad distringendum predictum Adam per terras et catalla ad valorem ducentarum librarum quas idem Willelmus petiit versus prefatum Adam, ibi venit predictus Radulfus et iudicium suum prius coram ipso redditum omnino adnichilauit : ad dampnum etc.

Item idem Willelmus queritur de predicto Radulfo de eo quod ei iniuriabatur in hoc quod cum idem Willelmus prosecutus fuisset placitum predictum per duos annos complete coram predicto Radulfo, et eciam post iudicium coram eodem Radulfo per dimidium annum, ubi ipsi de curia nunquam libertatem suam calumpniauerunt, ibi post predictos duos annos et dimidium remisit predictos recordum et processum ad prefatam curiam de Diuelina terminandum : iniuste et ad dampnum etc.

Item vbi idem Willelmus calumpniavit dicens quod post iudicium redditum non debet remitti loquela ad predictam curiam de Diuelina, idem Radulfus calumpnias suas in hac parte non audiuit set loquelam predictam remisit : ad graue dampnum ipsius Willelmi cc. librarum etc.

Et predictus Radulfus de Hengham venit et dicit quod non habuit breue domini Regis originale cum recordo et processu, set quoddam breue sub sigillo non cognito, et dicit quod non debuit procedere in predicto recordo sine breui originali et de hoc vocat rotulos et breue ad warrantum.

Et Willelmus dicit quod protulit breue originale sub sigillo capitalis iusticiarii Hibernie et de hoc vocat rotulos et breue ad warrantum.

Et predictus Radulfus ad secundam querelam dicit quod non adnullauit predictum recordum nec fecit eum iterum placitare. Et de hoc vocat recordum etc. Et predictus Willelmus similiter. Et ad hoc quod predictus Willelmus dicit quod breue de iudicio exiuit de quadraginta libris et vna marca, dicit predictus Radulfus quod breue exiuit sub nomine districcionis et non aliter : dicit eciam predictus Radulfus quod habuit quoddam breue domini Regis quod remitteret recordum illius loquale ad partes Hibernie, cuius transcriptum profert in hec verba :

‘Edwardus Dei gratia etc. dilecto et fideli suo Radulfo de Hengham salutem. Ex parte maioris et ciuium nostrorum Dublinie nuper nobis existit conquerendo monstratum quod cum per progenitores nostros Reges Anglie fuerat concessum eisdem quod cum de placitis placitatis in predicta ciuitate conqueri voluerit altera pars placitantium de errore aliquo seu grauamine eidem facto, idem error et grauamen coram iusticiario nostro capitali vel consilio nostro seu iusticiariis nostris de banco ibidem corrigi deberet et emendari. Et Willelmus de Canuile asserens errorem fieri in placito noto inter ipsum ex vna parte et Willelmum de Beuerlaco et Adam Hundred ciues nostros Dublinie ex altera in ciuitate predicta, dictum placitum coram vobis in Anglia fecerit euocari contra libertates et concessionem progenitorum nostrorum predictas in ipsorum ciuium detrimentum non modicum et iacturam. Nosque volentes dictorum ciuium nostrorum indemnitati respicere, vt tenemus, vobis mandamus quod, si ita est de placito supradicto, vos vlterius non intromittatis et recordum quod habetis in Anglia super predicto placito ad partes Hibernie transmittatis vt ibidem in forma premissa sepedictum placitum iusto modo et debito terminetur taliter vos habeatis in premissis ne predicti ciues nostri super hoc ad nos iterum recursum habere cogantur. Teste etc. apud Cundac¹ xij. die Iunii² anno regni nostri xvij.’

Et quia compertum est quod predictus Radulfus non habuit breue originale per quod potuit procedere et eciam compertum est per predictum breue domini quod predictus Radulfus procedere non potuit in predicta loquela in preiudicium predictorum cyuium, set quod remitteret predictam loquelam ad partes Hibernie: Ideo consideratum est quod Radulfus a querela ipsius Willelmi recedat quietus. Et Willelmus nichil capiat per querelam suam, set sit in misericordia pro falso clamio. Et condonatur quia pauper etc.

¹ Condat, near Libourne, dep. Gironde.

² Corrected from ‘Februarii.’

10

Defendants.—Ralph de Hengham, chief justice of King's Bench, with John de Lovetot, Richard de Boyland, and Thomas de Weyland.

Complainant.—William de Bardwell.

Reference to manuscript.—B., Membrane 6.

No other references.

Number of case in Appendix III., 95.

Willelmus de Berdewelle¹ capellanus queritur de Radulfo de Hengham, iusticiario domini Regis, quod cum idem Willelmus nuper in absencia domini Regis in partibus marinis agentis quodam breue de transgressionem coram dicto Radulfo et sociis suis contra abbatem sancti Edmundi et alios in breui detulisset: idem Radulfus, eo pretextu quod certum feodum de camera dicti abbatis perceperat, partem dicti abbatis contra iusticiarios manutenebat, et dictum Willelmum multum grauabat: quod cum ad diem placiti venisset et narratores dicti Willelmi secundum formam breuis sufficienter narrassent, dictus Radulfus ob fauorem abbatis predicti ex cautela precogitata narratores ipsius Willelmi ad placitandum vltra formam breuis induxit et ipsos audire noluit donec hoc fecerint, placitum dicti Willelmi taliter confundendo quod ex tenore breuis originalis et forma placiti liquido poterit apparere. Suff m. 6.

Queritur eciam quod Iohannes de Louetot et Ricardus de Boylonde iusticiarii domini Regis eo die cum abbate venerant ad iudicium, et consilium et auxilium eidem contra dictum Willelmum clam et palam inpendebant: queritur eciam quod Thomas de Weylaunde, tunc iusticiarius domini Regis, consilium et auxilium pro dicto abbate semper vna cum aliis iusticiariis supradictis inpendebat in placito supradicto. Et cum in [dicta] transgressionem fuisset placitum et ad inquisitionem capiendam deuenerit, et a parte dicti Willelmi petitur in iudicio remedium super eo videlicet quod [de] omnibus breuibz de iudicio, tam in placito isto quam in aliis, de libertate sancti Edmundi retorum breuis demandetur per v[icecomitem senes]callo libertatis sancti Edmundi et per ipsum senescallum balliuis ipsius abbatis in eadem libertate

¹ Bardwell, Suffolk.

Et quia rotuli predicti Radulfi in quibus predictum placitum continetur et omnia breuia et panella tangencia predictum placitum sunt in custodia predicti Gilberti, concordatum est per auditores etc. quod predictus Willelmus sequitur coram predicto Gilberto et ibi habeat suum recuperare si quid ostendendum sciat quod ea iniuria [facta] fuit per ipsum Radulfum in processu predicto vel minus rite pro parte sua actum quam agi debuit etc. Et dictum est predicto abbati quod eat inde sine die ad presens, saluo tamen eidem Willelmo iuratore suo si quod habeat etc. quando etc. coram eodem Gilberto . . . si sibi viderit expedire etc.

11

Defendant.—Roger de Lincoln, constable of Devon.

Complainant.—Thomas Silvester.

Reference to manuscript.—B., Membrane 40.

No other references.

Number of case in Appendix III., 111.

Rogerus de Lincolnia, constabularius Castri Exonie, attachiatus fuit ad respondendum Thome Silvester de eo quod idem Rogerus die Lune proxima ante festum sancti Dionisii anno regni Regis nunc xvj^o. in cimiterio sancti Petri in villa Exonie cepit eundem Thomam, et ipsum duxit in castrum predictum, et cum ingressus fuisset castrum illud, fecit claudere portas eiusdem castri, et ipsum verberavit et verberare fecit per sex ribaldos ignotos, et postea fecit ipsum trahi ad gaolam per tibeas, et cum ingressus fuisset hostium eiusdem gaole, idem Rogerus fecit eum compeditari de quatuor compedibus, et postea proici in profundum eiusdem gaole capite suo precedente sine scala, cuius gaole erat profunditas quindecim pedum, ponendo circa collum eius vnum carcaneum ferri et maniculas de ferro, ita quod per casum illum idem Thomas in illa prisa per totam noctem emisit sanguinem per nasum [et] os suum et fundamentum eius. Et ipsum ibidem detinuit a die Lune predicto vsque ad diem Veneris proximo sequentem hora septima illius diei, sine cibo et potu, per quod idem Thomas novies fuit in extasi propter illam angustiam et in statu mortis. Et similiter queritur de eo quod, cum idem Thomas fuisset balliuus domini Regis, Comitisse Albimarlie et Simonis de Monte Acuto de hundredo de

Devoñ.
m. 40.

Wynforde,¹ ac cepisset quadraginta aueria pro debito domini Regis, per extractas quas idem Rogerus ei liberauit per quindecim dies post deliberacionem suam a prisa predicta et illa aueria fugasset ad curiam de Wonforde, capitale parcum ipsius hundredi, in quo idem Thomas habuit quadraginta aueria sua propria: Idem Rogerus simul cum Ricardo de Paulesholte, ianitore predicti castri, et aliis hominibus ignotis, venit ibidem, et omnia aueria predicta fugauit et fugare fecit ad castrum predictum et illa vendidit sine causa: et cum vendita fuerunt idem Thomas appropinquauit eundem Rogerum et petiit ab eo quare aueria illa vendidit qui ei respondit quod sibi nocebit in quantum potuit, quousque fecisset sibi quietam clamanciam et relaxacionem de omnibus accionibus suis versus eundem Rogerum et de inprisonamento predicto. Et cum idem Thomas recusauit facere predictas quietam clamanciam et relaxacionem, idem Rogerus amerciauit duodecim plegios ipsius Thome qui ipsum plegiauerunt de predicta prisa, videlicet quemlibet ipsorum ad quadraginta denarios, vnico plegio excepto. Vnde illa de causa ipsum postea amerciauit in comitatu sine iudicio et consideracione vt ipsum faceret mendicum: per quod inprisonamentum atque oppressiones eiusdem Rogeri idem Thomas amisit de bonis suis ad valenciam centum librarum, ita quod exulat a patria illa nec ausus est ibi moram trahere, et ob causas illas idem Rogerus intulit actenus grauamina omnibus amicis eiusdem Thome. Vnde dicit quod deterioratus est et dampnum habet ad valenciam ducentarum librarum etc.

Et Rogerus venit et dicit quod idem Thomas tempore predicto fuit balliuus domini Regis, et gratis venit in castro Exonie ad reddendum compotum suum de omnimodis receptis in tempore balliue sue, vnde remansit in arreragiis de triginta et sex libris: ob quod arestatus fuit et missus ad prisonam domini Regis et detentus quousque soluisset predicta arreragia. Postea amici eiusdem Thome venerunt ibidem et manuceperunt soluendi predictum pecuniam pro eo infra certam diem. Et cum dies ille fuisset preteritus, idem Thomas venit et intrauit quaterviginti aueria de bona voluntate sua tanquam sua propria pro quadam parte arreragiorum illorum. Et cum idem Rogerus aueria illa detinuisset per quindecim dies postea vel amplius, fecit illa appreciari et vendi prout decet. Et per dimidium annum postea, quia idem Thomas non satisfecit de arrerariis illis, fecit distringere eius manucaptos veniendi ad

¹ Wonford.

scaccarium domini Regis in eodem castro : qui cum ibidem venerunt, amerciati fuerunt per consideracionem eisdem scaccarii pro manucapcione predicta. Et quoad amerciamenta ipsius Thome dicit quod ipsum nunquam amerciavit nec inprisonavit sicut queritur. Et hoc petit quod inquiretur per patriam. Et Thomas quoad amerciamentum predictorum manucaptorum petit iudicium, desicut idem Rogerus cognoscit quod ipsi amerciati fuerunt per consideracionem predicti scaccarii. Et idem Rogerus tenuit predictum scaccarium predictis die et loco et eos amerciavit pro voluntate sua et non per pares suos secundum communem legem Anglie. Et Rogerus non potest hoc dedicere. Ideo ipse in misericordia.

Et quoad inprisonamentum dicit quod ipsum imprisonavit sicut queritur. Dicit eciam quod nunquam reddidit ei predictum compotum nec aliquos manucaptos ei inuenit pro aliquo debito, nec predicta aueria intrauit, et hoc petit quod inquiretur per patriam. Ideo preceptum est coronatoribus quod venire faciant hic a die Pasche in vnum mensem xxiiij^{or} etc., per quos etc., et qui nec etc., ad certificandum etc. quia tam etc. Jacobus de Oxtone de comitatu Deuonie, Willelmus Darwyne de eodem comitatu, Robertus Tisson de eodem comitatu, Simon de Monte Acuto de eodem comitatu, Willelmus de Bustone de comitatu Lincolnie, Eustachius de Lincolnia de eodem comitatu manuceperunt predictum Rogerum de habendo eum hic ad prefatum terminum etc.

12

Defendant.—John de Lovetot, justice.

Complainant.—John, son of Hubert de Harlow.

References to manuscript.—B., Membranes 28 and 28d.

No other references.

Number of case in Appendix III., 113.

Iohannes filius Huberti de Herlawe¹ queritur de Iohanne de Luuetot quod cum idem Iohannes Huberd habuisset nutrituram corporis Iohannis filii Petri de Pereuile per assignacionem eiusdem Petri patris predicti Iohannis, ipso Petro superstite, et post mortem eiusdem Petri predictus Iohannes Huberd intrasset in

Essex.
m. 28.

¹ Harlow, Essex.

tenementa predicti Petri in villa de Matchynges,¹ nomine eiusdem Iohannis filii Petri, et tamquam custos eiusdem Iohannis, et de eisdem tenementis seisitus fuisset de prima septimana Pasche anno regni Regis nunc xv. vsque in diem Martis proximam ante festum sancte Margarete anno predicto: Ad quem diem Gilbertus filius Willelmi de Denemawe,² Clemens de Cokham³ et Willelmus le Enueyse de Wydyngton⁴ venerunt cum lx. hominibus ignotis, vi et armis et contra pacem, ad domum predicti Iohannis supradictam, et ibidem intrauerunt ad pugnandum cum hominibus predicti Iohannis Huberd, et quosdam homines suos intra domos predictas tenuerunt et quosdam extra, ita quod neque potuerunt intrare neque exire. Per quod idem Iohannes Huberd recenter eodem die adiuit comitatum Essexie, et in pleno comitatu questus fuit vicecomiti comitatus predicti, videlicet Hugoni le Blund, qualiter homines ignoti fuerunt ingressi domum suam, et ibi se tenuerunt vi et armis, et vnde supplicauit predicto vicecomiti quod huiusmodi vim contra pacem Regis amoueret. Per quod predictus vicecomes ordinauit et precepit Iohanni Tracy, coronatori comitatus predicti, Willelmo de Rothynges⁵ constabulario et custodi pacis, et Waryno balliuo Regis in hundredo illo, quod ipsi adirent domos predicti Iohannis apud Matchynges, et ibi viderent si querela predicti Iohannis fuit vera necne, et si inuenirent ibi huiusmodi vim, quod illam amouerent, vel quod ipsi attachiarent huiusmodi vim inferentes ad predicti Iohannis Huberd sectam. Ac iidem coronator, constabularius et balliuus ibidem venerunt cum albis virgis suis ad domum predicti Iohannis Huberd, et ibidem inuenerunt Gilbertum filium Willelmi de Denemawe, Clementem de Cokham, et Willelmum le Enueyse de Wydytone cum hominibus ignotis vi et armis, sicut predictus Iohannes Huberd querebatur. Et vnde preceptum fuit per predictos coronatorem, constabularium et balliuum ex parte domini Regis predictis Gilberto et aliis quod deponerent vim illam et quod se reddidissent ad pacem domini Regis: qui illud noluerunt facere set saggitauerunt ad coronatorem predictum et ipsum percusserunt per medium tabardi, ita quod fere ipsum occidissent. Per quod idem coronator leuauit hutesium super eos, tamquam super eos qui fuerunt contra pacem domini Regis. Per quod patria congregauit ibi iuxta statutum domini Regis ad remouendum huiusmodi vim. Inter quos venit quidam Ricardus

¹ Matching.² Dunmow.³ Cookham.⁴ Widdington.⁵ Roothering.

filius Willelmi de Herlawe, consanguineus predicti Iohannis Huberd : et vnde idem Ricardus filius Willelmi ibi in presencia predicti coronatoris occisus fuit ad pedes suos. Per quod predicti coronator, constabularius et balliuis cum potestate patrie ceperunt predictum Gilbertum et xxvj. homines de comitiua sua, qui ibi venerant secum per quos ¹ idem Ricardus occisus fuit. Et vnde idem coronator statim super illo facto cepit inquisitionem quis predictum Ricardum occidisset. Et compertum fuit coram eo quod Clemens de Cokham ipsum occidit : qui ibi venit per predictum Gilbertum.

Et postea iidem coronator, constabularius et balliuis duxerunt ipsum Gilbertum et alios quos ceperunt apud Chelmersforde ² et ipsos liberauerunt vicecomiti, tamquam homines contra pacem etc. Et postea venerunt amici predicti Gilberti ad predictum vicecomitem, et supplicauerunt ei quod dimitteret predictum Gilbertum sub manucapcione vsque ad proximam deliberacionem, et promiserunt eidem vicecomiti decem marcas vt esset eis auxilians et fauorabilis ad acquietandum eos de predicta feloniam : de quibus decem marcis satisfactum fuit ei de vij. marcis. Et predicto coronatori promiserunt decem libras per hoc quod recordaretur quod ipsi reddiderunt se paci antequam predictus Ricardus occisus fuit. Et vnde predictus Iohannes Huberd queritur quod predictus Gilbertus et alii procurauerunt Iohannem de Luuetot quod ipse esset iusticiarius assignatus ad deliberacionem eorum faciendam et adiuuaret eos ad acquietandum se inde : et ei dederunt propter hoc xx. marcas, et Henrico de Gildeforde clerico suo c. solidos ad procurandum negocium illorum. Per quod idem Iohannes de Luuetot cepit inquisitionem inde per homines affines et consanguineos predictorum prisonatorum, maxime per Radulfum le Merke, consanguineum predicti Gilberti, Ricardum Ledet cuius sororem Willelmus le Enuoyse tunc inprisonatus duxit in vxorem, Willelmum Pontyn fratrem predicti Willelmi le Enuoyse, et alios suspectos affinitatis et consanguinitatis. Et sic per dona predicta data iusticiario, clerico suo, vicecomiti et coronatori predictis predictum murdrum conclatum est, et predicta dampna sic secuta sunt : prout idem Iohannes Huberd paratus est verificare per totum comitatum Essexie.

Item idem Iohannes queritur de predicto Iohanne de Luuetot quod iniuste fecit vicecomitem Essexie per breue suum capere

¹ MS. quod.

² Chelmsford.

predictum Iohannem Huberd et ducere apud Colecestre¹ per quemdam Iohannem de Blanmouster ballium eiusdem vicecomitis. Et postea cum idem Iohannes Huberd venit coram Iohanne L[ouetot] et Ricardo de Boylande, et supplicauit quod dicerent ei occasionem quare ipse fuit sic arestatus. et vnde iidem iusticiarii per examinacionem vicecomitis inuenerunt quod nichil fiebat iuste eidem Iohanni Huberd in predicta arestacione vnde dictum fuit eidem Iohanni quod adiret [ad] domum suam quousque aliud haberet in mandatis.

Item idem Iohannes Huberd queritur de predicto Iohanne Louetot quod cum idem Iohannes Huberd summonitus fuit coram eo in quadam inquisicione, et venit coram eo apud Waldene² die sancti Michaelis, predictus Iohannes Louetot ibi ipsum arrestauit sine breui, et ipsum liberauit vicecomiti tanquam prisonarium, et precepit eidem vicecomiti quod duceret eum apud Colecestre ad prisonam: ita quod vix ad requisicionem Rogeri de Leycestria et Iohannis de Bakewelle inuenit manucapcionem essendi coram eo quocumque faceret ei scire: sub qua manucapcione predictus Iohannes adhuc moratur.

Item idem Iohannes Huberd queritur de predicto Iohanne de Louetot quod cum idem Iohannes Huberd accusatus fuisset per quamdam inquisicionem, vnde iuratores eiusdem inquisicionis fuerunt inimici predicti Iohannis Huberd in quibus predictus Iohannes nunquam se posuit, coram predicto Iohanne Louetot et sociis suis iusticiariis in Banco, quod idem Iohannes Huberd fuit abettator cuiusdam falsi appelli: per quod preceptum fuit vicecomiti quod venire faceret predictum Iohannem Huberd ad certum diem ad respondendum Regi et aliis de se super hoc conquerentibus: predictus Iohannes Huberd nullam habuit responsionem, set preceptum fuit per predictum Iohannem de Louetot quod predictus Iohannes committeretur gaole propter illam transgressionem, vel quod statim faceret finem, et nichilominus quod statim responderet aliis de se conquerentibus, et vix potuit finem suum facere quin adhuc iret ad prisonam: et fecit finem pro quadraginta solidis quos vicecomes nunc ab eo exigit ad opus domini Regis. Et vnde queritur quod statim post illum finem factum, predictus Iohannes respondit et dixit quod non fuit abettator illius appelli, et hoc petiit quod inquireretur. Et vnde preceptum vicecomiti Essexie

¹ Colchester.² Saffron Walden.

quod venire faceret ad certum diem bonos et legales etc. Ad quem diem iuratores venerunt et dixerunt quod predictus Iohannes Huberd nunquam fuit abettator predicti falsi appelli, et sic ipsum acquietauerunt. Istas iniurias, inprisonamenta iniusta, et alias transgressiones fecit predictus Iohannes Louetot, et fieri fecit eidem Iohanni Huberd, ad dampnum ipsius Iohannis quadraginta librarum etc.

Et predictus Iohannes de Louetot venit et quoad recepcionem viginti marcarum, quas predictus Iohannes Huberd ipsum dicit recepisse de predicto Gilberto et aliis adhuc ut esset iusticiarius ad deliberacionem ipsius Gilberti et aliorum assignatus, dicit quod nunquam recepit illas viginti marcas, nec per aliquem alium recipi fecit. Et hoc paratus est verificare secundum quod auditores consideraerint.

Et Iohannes Huberd dicit quod Willelmus Madle senior, cuius filiam idem Gilbertus duxit in vxorem, predictas viginti marcas soluit Henrico de Gildeforde, clerico eiusdem Iohannis, qui medius fuit inter predictos Gilbertum et Iohannem de Louetot ad procurandum dominum suum quod esset iusticiarius ad deliberacionem predicti Gilberti et aliorum faciendam. Et hoc paratus est verificare per bonos et legales homines de comitatu Essexie quod predicte viginti marce [predicto Iohanni] de Louetot per manus predicti Willelmi de Madle liberate fuerunt. Et postea dictus Iohannes [de Louetot venit et] cognouit per sacramentum suum quod recepit quamdam [summam argenti.]

.

Four lines
defaced.

Quesiuit ulterius de predictis iuratoribus quis predictum Ricardum interfecit [et per cuius abbettum isti] indictati fuerunt de morte eiusdem Ricardi. Qui dixerunt quod quidam Radulfus le Keu, qui fuit cum [Clemente de C]okham, ipsum Ricardum interfecit, et quod per abbettum dicti Iohannis Huberd fuerunt omnes predicti indictati de predicta morte. [Ideo] precepit quod idem Iohannes Huberd attachiaretur pro predicto abbetto, et hoc iuste sicut ei videtur, ex quo indictatus fuit de abbetto; set videtur aliquibus quod in casu isto non est abbettum reputandum, et quod dictus Iohannes de Louetot in facto isto aliter processit quam debuerat. Et hoc idem asserit idem Iohannes Huberd.

Et Gilbertus filius Willelmi, de quo idem Iohannes Huberd

m. 28d.

queritur, iuratus et examinatus dicit et recognoscit per sacramentum suum quod cum ipse et plures alii essent in quadam domo apud Matchynges, quam quidem domum cum terris ad eam pertinentibus clamat dictus Gilbertus sibi pertinere ratione nutriture heredis dictorum tenementorum, venit ibi Iohannes Tracy coronator Essexie ducens secum quamplurimos ad sectam et querelam prefati Iohannis Huberd, qui in pleno comitatu apud Chelmersforde de eodem Gilberto et de omnibus aliis secum in eadem domo commorantibus querebatur : per quod idem coronator cum predictis hominibus ibidem accessit ad amouendum predictos Gilbertum et alios. Ita quod in predicto aduentu quidam Ricardus filius Iuliane interfectus fuit inter eos et statim, ipso Ricardo sic interfecto, omnes in predicta domo stantes cum eodem Gilberto preter ipsum G[ilbertum] et alios xxvj., quorum nomina inueniuntur in recordo deliberacionis gayole eorundem, fugerunt : et idem coronator dictum Gilbertum et predictos xxvj. arestauit et attachiauit quousque inuenerunt per inquisitionem qui de dicta felonia essent culpabiles. Et quia dubitabat indictari de dicta interfectione et felonia, promisit eidem coronatori xx. marcas de quibus quidem xx. marcis satisfecit eidem et statim ei soluit quinque marcas vt de predicta felonia non indictaretur. Et quod ipsum Gilbertum inter alios indictatos non posuisset.¹ Dicit eciam idem Gilbertus quod dictus coronator cepit inde inquisitionem incontinenti super dicta felonia, per quam inquisitionem quidam Clemens de Cokham et Radulfus cokus eiusdem Clementis inuenti fuerunt culpabiles. Et capta sic inquisitione predicta, idem coronator duxit dictum Gilbertum et alios xxvj. vsque ad Chelmersforde, et eos ibi liberauit Willelmo de Suttone, subuicecomiti Hugonis le Blunde tunc vicecomitis, per litteram suam patentem sigillo suo signatam : qui quidem Willelmus eos recepit et ibidem detinuit per vnum diem et vnam noctem vsque in diem crastinum quod finem fecerat cum predicto Willelmo de Suttone ad opus domini sui per decem marcas tali condicione, quod dictus Gilbertus, Willelmus frater eiusdem Gilberti, Radulfus filius Willelmi de Donemawe, Willelmus filius eiusdem Gilberti et Willelmus le Enuoyse non essent ducti ad gayolam Colecestre cum aliis attachiatis. De quibus quidem decem marcis dictus Gilbertus inuenit fideiussores, videlicet Radulfum Bygod et Iohannem de Durham, quos quidem fideiussores idem Hugo vicecomes implacitauit et per breue domini

¹ MS. polluisset.

Regis petiit versus eosdem fideiussores predictas x. marcas, quousque idem Gilbertus soluit eidem vicecomiti vij. marcas. Requisitus qualiter recessit postquam arestatus fuit et ductus apud Chelmersforde sicut dicitur superius, dicit quod facta promissione de predictis x. marcis et inuenta inde securitate per prefatos fideiussores, dictus Willelmus de Suttone ipsum Gilbertum et alios quinque per xij. manucaptos dimisit vsque ad proximam deliberacionem gayole. Et omnes alios attachiatos misit idem Willelmus de Suttone per capitalem ballium eiusdem comitatus vsque ad prisonam Colecestre. Dicit eciam idem Gilbertus quod, habito respectu per predictam manucapcionem, adiuit Iohannem de Louetot ipsum requirendo quod concederet ei ad gayolam Colecestre deliberandam ratione persone dicti Gilberti sic attachiati et aliorum predictorum. De qua quidem deliberacione Henricus de Gildeforde, clericus dicti Iohannis, medius fuit inter eos et procurator predicte deliberacionis, et hoc cognouit prefatus Iohannes de Louetot. Et qui quidem Iohannes dixit quod non potuit se intromittere de predicta deliberacione, eo quod profecturus erat in negociis domini Regis in Pontium.¹ Tamen inter eos conuenit quod idem Gilbertus eidem Iohanni de Louetot daret centum solidos ut ipsum ad deliberacionem suam adiuuaret: quos quidem denarios ei misit in quadam vesica, et idem Iohannes semper eosdem denarios penes se retinuit usque infra quindecim dies ante festum sancti Hillarii proximum preteritum, quos quidem denarios idem Iohannes tunc eidem Gilberto remisit. Requisitus ulterius predictus Gilbertus si conuenerit inter eum et dictum Henricum de Gildeforde quod idem Gilbertus predicta tenementa in Machingge cum pertinenciis de quibus contencio erat inter ipsum Gilbertum et prefatum Iohannem Huberd eidem Henrico dimitteret, ut idem Henricus in deliberacione sua ipsum Gilbertum iuuaret, dicit predictus Gilbertus quod sic, set quia vidit quod tenementa illa eidem Henrico warantizare non potuit, sicut idem Henricus vellet quod fecerat, idem Gilbertus volens uoluntati eiusdem Henrici omninodo satisfacere promisit ei centum solidos ut eidem Gilberto in deliberacione sua via qua posset meliori auxilium preberet et iuuamen; quos quidem centum solidos idem Henricus de eodem Gilberto recepit per recognicionem inde factam coram iusticiariis de Banco. Et Henricus, diligenter inde examinatus, recepcionem dictorum denariorum cognouit pro consilio et auxilio

¹ Ponthieu.

eidem Gilberto in dicta deliberacione per prefatum Henricum prestitio, et eciā in quadam assisa noue disseisine quam Iohannes de Peruille arrainauit per sectam ipsius Gilberti versus predictum Iohannem Huberd et alios in breui coram Thoma de Weylande et predicto Iohanne de Louetot, Iohanne Cobham, et Willelmo de Middeltone, iusticiariis assignatis apud Stratforde, eo quod predictus Gilbertus clamauit custodiam de predicto Iohanne de Peruille et tenementorum de quibus querebatur esse disseisitus.

Et quoad ultimam querelam super predictum Iohannem de Louetot de xl. s., inuentum est per rotulos iusticiariorum de Banco quoddam irrotulamentum in hec verba :

‘De Iohanne Huberd de Herlawe pro transgressione xl. s. pro plegiagiis Iohannis de Tracy et Ricardi de Wokindone.’

Et compertum est per examinacionem rotulorum inde factam quod predictus Iohannes Huberd non fuit culpabilis de aliqua transgressione, nisi tantum quod indictatus fuit de abetto indictamenti Gilberti filii Willelmi et aliorum indictatorum de morte Ricardi filii Iuliane, de quo abetto nondum fuit conuictus nisi tantum accusatus : per quod videtur eidem Iohanni Huberd quod quedam voluntas facta fuit ei per prefatum Iohannem de Louetot et non lex. Quando venit per attachiamentum coram prefato Iohanne de Louetot et sociis suis iusticiariis de Banco non potuit dare responsum donec fecerat finem per predictos xl. s., alioquin misisset eum in prisona, et hoc dixit ei predictus Iohannes de Louetot in pleno banco quod prefatus Iohannes Huberd eligeret vtrum mallet mitti ad prisonam vel finem facere. Et Iohannes de Louetot super hoc examinatus hoc idem bene cognouit. Et cum fecerat finem per predictos xl. s., dictum fuit per prefatum Iohannem de Louetot eidem Iohanni Huberd quod responderet incontinenti de se conquerentibus, qui respondit quod non fuit abettator indictamenti predictorum Gilberti filii Willelmi et aliorum, et super hoc posuit se super patriam : que venit et ipsum Iohannem de abetto predicto penitus aquietauit et hoc compertum est per recordum et processum rotulorum.

Postea venit Hugo le Blund quia inuentus fuit in curia. Iuratus et examinatus super receptione predictarum decem marcarum, bene cognouit quod implacitauit Radulfum Bigod et alios fideiussores dicti Gilberti de predicta promissione in comitatu Essexie apud Chelmesforde, quousque satisfecerunt eidem Hugoni de septem marcis in parte solucionis predictarum decem marcarum, set

dicit quod nullum denarium ab eo recepit per quod dominus Rex
 in aliquo esset perdens, nisi tantum ut eidem Gilberto in sua
 deliberacione consilium prestaret et auxilium. Et quia compertum
 est per recognicionem predicti Hugonis quod cepit predictas
 septem marcas in partem solucionis decem marcarum per manus
 predictorum Radulfi Bigod et aliorum fideiussorum eiusdem
 Gilberti ad dimittendum predictum Gilbertum et omnes alios
 indictatos de morte predicti Ricardi filii Iuliane per pleuinam qui
 per statutum Regis non fuerunt replegiabiles: et non potuit
 dedicere quin dimisit illos per pleuinam qui per commune breue
 sunt irreplegiabiles. Nec ostendere potuit idem Hugo quod aliquid
 breue Regis speciale habuit per quod ipsos sic de morte hominis
 indictatos dimittere potuit per pleuinam: consideratum est quod
 predictus Hugo committatur gaole. Postea predictus Hugo finem
 suum per viginti marcas per plegiagium Roberti Giffard militis et
 Nicholai de Wokingdone de comitatu Essexie. Et quia compertum
 est eciam per recognicionem predicti Henrici de Gildeforde quod
 procurauit dominum suum esse iusticiarium ad predictam delibera-
 cionem faciendam, et quod eidem Gilberto et aliis indictatis
 consilium et auxilium prestitit in sua deliberacione pro predictis
 centum solidis quos ab eodem Gilberto recepit, et ei hoc non licuit
 qui fuit ibi clericus iusticiariorum in predicta deliberacione: nec
 potuit dedicere quin manutenuit predictum Gilbertum et Iohannem
 de Peruille in placito predictae assise noue disseisine coram pre-
 dicto domino suo I[ohanne] de Louetot in capcione eiusdem assise
 assignato, et se ipso tunc clerico eiusdem Iohannis Louetot ibi
 existente, et hoc maxime contra statutum domini Regis: con-
 sideratum est quod predictus Henricus eat ad Turrim Londonie ibi
 moraturus pro voluntate domini Regis.

Gaola.

Gaola.

Postea predictus Henricus finem fecit cum Rege pro predicta
 transgressione per centum marcas. Et inde inuenit plegios suffi-
 cientes quorum nomina remanent penes magistrum Willelmum de
 Marchia thesaurarium domini Regis.

: : : : : : : : :

Four lines
 defaced.

Et quia predictus Gilbertus nichil fecit nisi ad saluacionem vite
 fame [etc., consideratum est quod] . . . predictus Gilbertus parum
 vel nichil deliquit in procuracionibus et donis suis predictis. Ideo
 predictus Gilbertus [inde sine die] . . .

per coff.
 Lincolnie.

13

Defendant.—John de Lovetot.

Complainant.—Thomas, prior of church of St. Mary of Butley.

Reference to manuscript.—B., Membranes 20, 20d.

Other references.—Membrane 11.

Number of case in Appendix III., 117.

Norff.
m. 20.

Thomas, prior ecclesie sancte Marie de Buttele,¹ queritur de Iohanne de Louetot de eo quod idem Iohannes irrotulare fecit in rotulis suis, ad maximam exheredacionem ecclesie predicti prioris, veredictum cuiusdam assise noue disseisine coram eodem Iohanne apud Disce² capte, inter Martinum filium Osberti le Prouost petentem et predictum priorem deforciatorem de vno mesuagio, vna acra, et vna roda terre cum pertinenciis in Somertone.³ Primo vbi iuratores dicebant quod predictus Martinus fuit villanus predicti prioris et fecit redempcionem carnis et sanguinis et finem fecit in propria persona cum predicto priore per viginti solidos pro habenda licencia se maritandi cuidam Matilli, ibi falso irrotulare fecit quod predicta Matillis fuit libera et fecit predictum finem, et non predictus Martinus : nec eciam irrotulare fecit quod dictus Martinus fuit natiuus predicti prioris sicut iuratores dixerunt. Item vbi iuratores dixerunt quod Osbertus, pater predicti Martini, fuit natiuus predicti prioris et fecit redempcionem carnis et sanguinis, de hoc nichil irrotulauit set omnino pretermisit. Item vbi iuratores dixerunt quod Humfridus, pater dicti Osberti et auus predicti Martini, fuit natiuus predicti prioris et fecit redempcionem carnis et sanguinis, ibi irrotulare fecit quod predicti iuratores dixerunt quod hoc ignorauerunt. Item vbi predicti iuratores dixerunt quod erat quidam Edricus abauus predicti Martini, et de ipso Edrico per Iohannem de Louetot requisiti vtrum erat natiuus et fecit redempcionem carnis et sanguinis vel non, dixerunt quod nescierunt, ibi irrotulare fecit idem Iohannes quod omnino fuit liber homo et ex se ipso vlterius irrotulare fecit quod predictus Edricus fuit filius cuiusdam Wolnerici qui fuit liber homo ; de quo Wolnerico predicti iuratores nullam fecerunt mencionem, nec vnquam talis Wolnericus fuit in

¹ Butley, a priory of Black Canons, near Woodbridge, Suffolk.

² Diss, Norfolk.

³ West Somerton, near Caistor, Norfolk.

rerum natura. Item vbi predictus prior respondit per quemdam Ricardum de Hemmesby, vt per ballium suum, ad predictam assisam, qui quidem ballius non habuit potestatem ad ponendum ius sanguinis natiui domini sui in iuratam vel in iudicium in absencia domini sui: ibi irrotulare fecit falso quod predictus prior ibi fuit in propria persona sua respondens. Et sic super istam falsam irrotulacionem (qui omnino erat contraria veredicto predictorum iuratorum secundum quod predictus prior per predictos iuratores assise predicte, qui omnes adhuc sunt superstites, paratus est verificare et similiter per quicquid curia domini Regis considerabit), iudicauit predictus Iohannes de Louetot predictum Martinum esse liberum et libere condicionis, et quod predictus Martinus recuperaret tenementa predicta versus dictum priorem et ipsum amerciavit ad centum solidos, ad dampnum ipsius prioris ccc. librarum etc.

Et Iohannes de Louetot venit et dicit quod non debet inde respondere sine Willelmo de Pageham qui fuit ibi secum iusticiarius assignatus. Et Willelmus venit per breue Regis et predictus prior et Iohannes similiter. Et predicti Iohannes et Willelmus dicunt quod bene et rite processerunt ad capcionem predicte assise, vnde vocant recordum rotulorum suorum qui sunt in thesauro sub custodia Elye de Bekyngham, qui quidem recordum et processus missi sunt coram auditoribus in hec verba:

‘Assisa capta apud Disce coram I. de Louetot et W. de Pageham iusticiariis assignatis die Lune proxima ante festum sancti Michaelis anno regni regis Edwardi filii regis Henrici xvj°.’

[This record not printed.]

Postea visis et auditis predictis recordo et processu, predictus Iohannes de Louetot requisitus per auditores vtrum predictus prior personaliter venit ad respondendum prefato Martino ad predictam assisam vel per ballium, dicit quod prior venit ibi per quemdam Ricardum de Hemmesby ballium suum et eciam alias apud Westmonasterium quando iudicium inde redditum fuit. Et predictus Willelmus de Pageham coram auditoribus per se requisitus de eodem hoc idem cognouit. Et predictus Willelmus coram auditoribus petit ab attornato prioris si aliquid velit dicere erga eum: et attornatus dicit quod non. Ideo ipse Willelmus inde etc. ad presens. Et quia compertum est in recordo quod quidam Iohannes de Pykeringes, vnus recognitorum prefate assise, pro eo quod in veredicto prefate assise narrando illud veredictum contrarius fuit omnibus aliis recognitoribus, narrando aliud quam inter

eos fuit prouisum sicut per examinacionem eorum con[^avictum fuit
o]b quod manucaptus fuit per Thomam de Begeuille militem
et alios sicut in eodem recordo continetur, prefatus Iohannes
iterum requisitus [fuit] qualiter processerunt ad capcionem pre-
fate assise, ex quo predicti xij. recognitores non fuerunt de vno et
eodem assensu in suo veredicto. Et Iohannes dicit quod quando
Iohannes de Pykeringes et socii sui xij. iuratores erant carcerati et
postea redierunt ad pronunciandum veredictum suum, predictus
Iohannes de Pykeringes pro se et sociis suis primo ore suo proprio
ex assensu omnium sociorum suorum pronunciauit omnia que
contenta sunt in veredicto contento in predicto recordo. Et
accepto illo veredicto dictum fuit eidem Iohanni de Pykeringes et
prefatis sociis suis per ipsum Iohannem de Luuetot quod si forte
comptum esset quod dictus Martinus disseisitus esset per priorem
et alios, quod tractarent inter eos et taxarent que dampna idem
Martinus sustinuit occasione illius disseisine. Et dicunt quod
predictus Iohannes de Pykeringes hoc audito incontinenti dixit quod
nunquam aliud d[ampnum de eo] quod ipse Martinus villanus fuit.
Et sic dicit Iohannes de Luuetot quod ex quo ipse et Willelmus de
Pageham socius suus inuenerunt prefatum Iohannem [de] Pykeringes
sic contrarium sociis suis et veredicto prius ore suo pronunciato,
separauerunt ipsum de sociis suis et iniunxerunt prefatis xj. [sociis] . .
suis recognitoribus predictis ad interloquendum super veredicto
predicto. Qui quidem xi. recognitores absque ipso Iohanne omnia
que prius dicta erant in predicto ver[edicto sicut in recordo]
continetur [confirmaverunt], ipso Iohanne de Pykeringes non
concedente nec consenciente, ob quod postea arestatus fuit et
manucaptus prout patet [supra]. . . . Dixerunt tamen quod vtrum
predictus Martinus fuit villanus necne ignorauerunt. Et vnde pre-
dictus Iohannes de Luuetot dicit quod predict[us] Willelmus] audito
et accepto veredicto predicto per predictos xi. recognitores simul
cum prefatis xj. recognitoribus taxauit dampna ipsius Martini ad
v[nam] marcam. Et quia] Willelmus de Pageham per licenciam
auditorum et non per sectam prioris a curia inde recessit quietus,
videtur tamen auditoribus quod exped[it ipsum esse] . . . alias
coram eis examinandum super quibusdam articulis predictos recor-
dum et processum tangentibus: preceptum est vicecomiti quod
[haberet etc. in crastino] Assencionis Domini etc. Et quia in
consideracione super veredicto prime assise comptum est quod
Iohannes Pykeringes vnus [recognitorum predictorum in narrando]

veredictum contrarius fuit omnibus aliis recognitoribus narrando aliud quam inter eos fuit prius et nichil de illo contrario in recordo [continetur], . . . immo quod veredictum captum fuit et receptum ac si omnes de vno et eodem assensu fuissent in veredicto predicto [nec dicitur] . . . sive specificatur etc. nec duodecimus ab xj. fuit separatus nec examinatus nec xj. a duodecimo separati nec per se examinati etc. prout paratus est [verificare] . . . subsecutum fuit iudicium non legi sive consuetudine regni consonum videtur manifeste quod recordum illud [falsum est Et] eciam quia in predicto recordo non inuenitur vtrum prefatus prior seisisus fuit de dicto Martino die quo [obiit sicut de natiuo] . . . et villano suo vel eciam si idem prior vel predecessores sui seisiti fuissent de Osberto patre ipsius [Martini et de Humfrido] patre predicti Osberti nec de natiuis et villanis suis capiendo ab ipsis Humfrido, Osberto et Martino quia constat per confessionem predicti Martini super hoc requisiti et per confessionem predictorum Iohannis et Willelmi iusticiariorum ad assisam predictam in propria persona sua, immo per quemdam Ricardum de Hemmesby balliuum [qui non habuit potestatem ponendi] ius sanguinis natiui domini sui in iudicium concordatum est quod assisa predicta re-examinetur etc. Ideo preceptum est vicecomiti [quod haberet etc. in crastino] Assencionis Domini recognitores assise predictae etc. Et preceptum est vicecomiti quod scire faciat predicto Martino quod sit hic ad prefatum diem ad [audiendum examinacionem] assise predictae ad faciendum de et recipiendum etc. Et idem dies datus est predicto Iohanni de Luuetot etc. P[ostea] venerunt recognitores predictae assise, et similiter Martinus predictus, Iohannes et Willelmus aliud recordati fuerunt . . . [sicut com]pertum fuit per recordum rotulorum . . . [in] thesauro domini Regis. Et eciam quia iuratores predicti minus sufficienter fuerunt examinati super articulis predictis sicut patet in r[otulo] . . . iuratores iurati et examinati qui dicunt super sacramentum suum quod . . . Martinus fuit villanus ipsius prioris die quo eiect[us] . . . quod predictus Martinus perquisiuit predicta villanus [pre]d[ict]am terram emit . . . de villa de . . .

Postea de crastino Auimarum mandauit dominus Rex breue suum in hec verba :

‘Edwardus Dei gratia Rex Anglie, Dominus Hibernie, et Dux m. 20d.
Aquitanie venerabili in Christo patri I. Wyntoniensi episcopo et sociis

suis auditoribus querelarum, salutem. Cum nuper ad querelam prioris de Buttele venire fecissemus coram vobis apud Westmonasterium Iohannem de Lauetot nuper iusticiarium nostrum ad respondendum eidem priori de quibusdam iniuriis eidem priori per prefatum Iohannem in capcione cuiusdam assise noue disseisine, quam Martinus filius Osberti de West Somertone arrainauit coram prefato Iohanne et sociis suis nuper iusticiariis nostris ad assisas in comitatu Norffolcie capiendas assignatis per breue nostrum, versus predictum priorem de tenementis in West Somertone, per quod recordum et processum eiusdem assise coram vobis venire fecimus vt errorem, si quem in eisdem recordo et processu inueniri contigerit, corrigi et emendari et predictis partibus iusticiam debitam inde fieri faceretur, ac vos, licet in processu predictæ assise coram prefato Iohanne et sociis suis predictis capte aut in iudicio eiusdem error aliquis non interuenerit, sicut in predictis recordo et processu manifeste apparet, vt dicitur, seisinam tamen predictam tenementorum quam predictus Martinus versus predictum priorem per recognicionem assise predictæ coram prefato Iohanne et predictis sociis suis recuperauit prefato priori adiudicastis, ipso Martino coram vobis non vocato, in ipsius Martini dampnum non modicum et exheredacionem manifestam vt ex querela sua accipimus: nos igitur super predicto facto vestro certiorari et prefato Martino si sibi in aliquo iniuriatum fuit iusticiam fieri volentes, in hac parte vobis mandamus quod recordum et processum querele predictæ coram vobis habite vna cum predictis recordo et processu predictæ assise coram prefato Iohanne et sociis suis predictis capte qui coram vobis venire fecimus ex causa predicta, nobis sub sigillo vestro prefati episcopi distincte et aperte mittatis et hoc breue, ita quod ea habeamus a die sancti Michaelis in xv. dies vbicumque tunc fuerimus in Anglia vt inspectis recordis et processibus predictis fieri faciamus in premissis quod de iure et secundum legem et consuetudinem regni nostri fuerit faciendum. Teste me ipso apud Berewyke super Twede viij. die Augusti anno regni nostri xix.’

Postea mandauit dominus Rex auditoribus breue suum in hec verba :

‘Edwardus Dei gratia Rex Anglie, Dominus Hibernie, et Dux Aquitanie venerabili in Christo patri I. eadem gratia episcopo Wyntoniensi salutem. Ex parte dilecti nobis in Christo Prioris de Buttele nobis est ostensum quod cum ipse nuper conquestus esset coram vobis et sociis vestris auditoribus querelarum de ministris

nostris factarum quod Iohannes de Luuetot in assisa noue disseisine quam Martinus filius Osberti de Somertone arrainavit coram eodem Iohanne et Willelmo de Pageham per breue nostrum versus predictum priorem et alios in breui nostro originali contentos, de tenementis in Somertone, veredictum iuratorum predictæ assise aliter quam per eosdem in curia nostra coram eisdem Iohanne et Willelmo extitit pronunciatum in rotulis eiusdem Iohannis irrotulare fecit, et ad iudicium inde reddendum minus rite processit et predictum Martinum tenementum predictum et dampna sua ea occasione habita recuperare adiudicauit, per quod recordum et processum eiusdem assise coram vobis et sociis vestris venire fecimus ad certiorandum vos super negocio predicto: vos quamquam recordo illo et processu per vos plenius examinatis et errore in eisdem comperto ea irritari feceritis, dampna tamen que idem prior sustinuit ex causa predicta ei adiudicare vel taxare hucusque non curastis, in ipsius prioris dampnum grauissimum et iacturam. Et quia predictus prior predicto Martino de dampnis ei occasione predictæ disseisine licet minus iuste adiudicatis diu est satisfecit, et dampna plurima sustinuit, ex hac causa volumus super negocio illo habere tractatum et eidem priori debitam super premissis fieri iusticiam. Vobis mandamus quod si iudicium per vos inde redditum sit, tunc recordum et processum querele predictæ et loquele inde coram vobis habite cum omnibus ea tangentibus nobis sub sigillo vestro sine dilacione mittatis et hoc breue, ut recordo illo et processu inspectis quod iustum fuerit in hac parte fieri faciamus. Teste me ipso apud Bergeveny xxvj. die Octobris anno regni nostri decimo nono.

14

Defendant.—Solomon de Rochester, justice.

Complainant.—Henry, son of Nicholas of St. Edmunds.

Reference to manuscript.—B., Membrane 30d.

No other references.

Number of case in Appendix III., 136.

Henricus filius Nicholai de sancto Edmundo queritur de Salomone de Roffa quod cum ipse iure hereditario successisset Nicholao patri suo in manerio de Wyke¹ cum pertinenciis et

Suff.
m. 30d.

¹ Wicken.

aduocacionibus ecclesiarum de Berdeswelle¹ et Gnateshale,² ac Robertus filius Fulconis quondam persona ecclesie de Berdewelle postea iudicio ecclesie sentencialiter priuatus fuisset de eadem, et dictus Henricus tamquam verus patronus presentasset ad eandem quemdam Willelmum clericum, qui ad presentationem suam absque alicuius calumpnia ad eandem ecclesiam fuit admissus, et per loci diocesanum institutus, et eciam in tota vita sua pacifice eam possedisset; predictus Robertus iusticiarius in itinere ultimo in comitatu Suffolcie Salomoni de Roffa associatus,³ cogitauit qualiter illam ecclesiam posset habere. Falso et maliciose ad predicti Henrici confusionem quasdam billas continentes quod dictus Henricus quosdam felones domini Regis receptasset coram se et sociis suis procurauit presentari et ipsum Henricum per predictum Salomonem fecit inprisonari, qui quidem Salomon manu sua propria tradidit iuratoribus de hundredo de Saunforde⁴ quamdam billam super dicta receptacione felonum contra predictum Henricum inducendo eos quod dictam receptacionem presentassent. Et cum dicti iuratores super billa illa plane consulissent et dictum Henricum culpabilem non inuenissent, dictus Salomon quia ipsum Henricum indictare noluerunt totam iuramentum illam inprisonauit. Et dictus Salomon continuando maliciam suam precogitatum procurauit priorem de Bromholme⁵ implacitare predictum Henricum de aduocacione ecclesie de Berdewelle coram se et sociis suis apud Gateshille ad instanciam dicti Roberti filii Fulconis: et ipse Salomon dictum priorem in predicto placito manutenebat, licet [nec] idem prior nec ecclesia de Bromholme a principio mundi vsque ad dictum tempus itineris de predicta aduocacione fuissent seisisi, et hoc fecit dictus Salomon ad procuracionem predicti Roberti filii Fulconis, quia ad ecclesiam illam in litigio contra statutum domini Regis presentatus [est]: et sic dictus Henricus iniuriis eorundem et timore mortis et incarcerationis ductus, volens potius dictam aduocacionem amittere quam vitam, cum alias non posset euadere ius suum de eadem ecclesia per circumuencionem eorundem pro xl. marcis dicto priori concessit, nec aliter potuit dictus Henricus cum predicto Roberto concordari. Et cum viri religiosi propter statutum domini Regis possessiones aliquas absque gracia domini

¹ Bardwell.² Knettishall.³ April 1286, *Cal. Pat. Rolls*, 1281-1292, p. 243.⁴ Samford.⁵ Broomholme, a Cluniac priory, in Norfolk, between Cromer and Yarmouth.

Regis de cetero adquirere nequiuissent,¹ dictus Salomon et socii sui contra statutum predictum machinantes et dicto priori firmam securitatem parare volentes, nullam securitatem eidem Henrico facere voluerunt super predicta ordinacione, magnam assisam transire procurarunt in hac parte, que quidem assisa respectum habens ad compositionem factam, dicebant quod tunc temporis dictus prior plures² iuratores habuit in sua petitione quam Henricus in sua defensione, quia dictus Salomon sic eos carcauit, et taliter per potenciam et maliciam eorundem precogitatam dictus Henricus fuerat exheredatus in fraudem statuti ac dampnum suum mille marcarum etc.

Et Salomon venit et dicit quod Ricardus de Boylaunde et magister Thomas de Sodyngtone fuerunt ibi socii sine quibus non debet respondere. Ideo preceptum est vicecomiti quod venire faciat eos hic ad hunc diem ad respondendum simul cum predicto Salomone predicto Henrico. Ad quem diem tam predicti Ricardus et Thomas quam prefatus Salomon et Henricus veniunt. Et Salomon dicit quod nunquam talem billam liberauit, et dicit quod si ipsam liberasset hoc posset secundum legem et consuetudinem regni aduocare. Quia dicit quod in itinere iusticiariorum talis est consuetudo pro pace obseruanda quod cuicumque de populo huiusmodi billam optulerit cuicumque iusticiario maiori vel minori idem iusticiarius illam billam debet recipere, et tradere eam duodenis iuratoribus ad capitula corone, ita quod si verum sit quod in ea continetur ipsi presentant illud in veredicto suo, et si non sit verum quod deniant illam billam. Et quia ista consuetudo approbata est, ideo quoad hoc inde quietus. Et quoad imprisonmentum iidem Salomon et socii sui dicunt quod idem Henricus inprisonatus fuit per vicecomitem et per legem terre et per iudicium, sicut videri potest per rotulos eiusdem itineris. Et quoad predictam magnam assisam, dicunt quod prior de Bromholme implacitauit eundem Henricum in itinere suo in comitatu Suffolcie et petiit versus eum aduocationem ecclesie de Berdewelle per breue de recto. Et idem Henricus venit in plena curia et posuit se in magnam assisam domini Regis, que quidem magna assisa per quatuor milites ad hoc iuratos solempniter electa fuit, et postea solempniter coram omnibus iusticiariis in plena curia capta. Ita quod milites eiusdem magne assise dixerunt precise super

¹ Statute of Mortmain.² MS. plus.

sacramentum suum quod prefatus prior maius ius habuit in eadem aduocacione quam predictus Henricus. Et quod ita sit tam de dicto inprisonamento quam de captione prefate assise vocant rotulos suos de eodem itinere qui sunt in thesauria domini Regis. Postea per camerarios domini Regis delati fuerunt predicti rotuli coram auditoribus in presencia cancellarii. Et compertum est in rotulis de corona eiusdem itineris per presentationem duodenorum de hundredo de Saunforde quod predictus Henricus maliciose cepit vnam suam et eam retinuit tanquam weyf, quousque predicta sues habuit porcellos et predictam suam et porcellos vltius retinuit quousque fuerant porci et eos tunc posuit in lardario suo et eos aduocavit tanquam weyf. Et quia conuictum fuit coram eisdem iusticiariis quod nullum weyf habuit, nec aliquod warantum inde ostendere potuit, propter quod iusticiarii ad coronam considerauerunt quod dominus Rex recuperaret predictos porcos, et idem Henricus custodiretur. Et in rotulis placitorum eiusdem itineris compertum est quod prefatus prior de Bromholme petiit predictam aduocacionem versus predictum Henricum per breue de recto narrando versus eum secundum legem regni. Et quod prefatus Henricus defendebat se versus eum secundum legem terre et posuit se in magnam assisam domini Regis et quod eadem assisa solempniter electa fuit et capta secundum legem et consuetudinem regni, per quod videtur auditoribus quod nulla collusio, seu aliqua iniuria, seu transgressio eidem Henrico per prefatum Salomonem vel per iusticiarios facta fuit. Et quia idem Henricus maliciose prefatam querelam fecit ad subuertendum leges et consuetudines regni approbatas consideratum est quod prefatus Salomon et socii sui inde quieti et prefatus Henricus custodiatur per cancellarium. Postea venit predictus Henricus et fecit finem coram auditoribus per quadraginta solidos per plegios Stephanum de Haukesdone et Willelmum de Berdewelle, capellanum de comitatu Suffolcie.

15

Defendant.—William de Saham, justice.

Complainant.—Robert, son of Simon de Stanton.

Reference to extract.—B., Membrane 19.

No other reference.

Number of case in Appendix III., 148.

Robertus filius Simonis de Stanton¹ queritur de Willelmo de Saham et sociis suis, nuper iusticiariis itinerantibus in comitatu predicto, de eo quod cum dominus Ricardus de Holebroke ad mandatum domini Regis tradidisset predicto Roberto et fratribus suis custodiam corporis, terrarum et bonorum predicti Simonis patris predicti Roberti, quia predictus Simon freneticus erat et in tali statu quod de bonis suis disponere non potuit: nichilominus tamen predictus Simon se a custodia predicti Roberti et fratrum suorum elongavit et manerium suum de Stanton domino Nicholao de Segrave vendidit contra voluntatem predicti Roberti et fratrum suorum: propter quod predictus Robertus accessit ad dominum Regem et impetrauit breue directum domino Comiti Cornubie, tunc tenenti locum domini Regis in Anglia, in hec verba:

Hunt.
m. 19.

‘Edwardus etc. dilecto et fideli suo Edmundo Comiti Cornubie locum suum tenenti in Anglia, salutem. Grauem querimoniam Roberti de Stanton, filii et heredis Simonis de Stanton, audiuius continentem quod cum idem Simon iam per viginti annos et amplius quodam morbo vicissim grauatus et detentus et mentis inmemor extiterit, per quod iam tribus annis et amplius elapsis mandauimus dilecto et fideli nostro Ricardo de Holebroke quod eidem Simoni aliquem certum custodem assignaret et competentem sustentacionem sibi de terris et tenementis suis habere faceret, prout in hiis casibus hactenus fieri consuevit, ac prefatus Ricardus custodiam illam prefato Roberto et ceteris filiis ipsius Simonis tradidisset: idem Simon a custodibus suis predictis, ipsis ignorantibus, se nuper elongavit et dilecto et fideli nostro Nicholao de Segraue adherendo quandam partem terrarum suarum eidem Nicholao vendidit, in nostri preiudicium et prefati Roberti exheredacionem manifestam. Et quia huiusmodi factum si perpetratum fuerit iuste et modo debito volumus emendari, vobis

¹ Fenstanton, near St. Ives, Hunts.

mandamus quod auditis et plenius intellectis hiis que dictus Robertus filius prefati Simonis vobis exponet in premissis, si vobis constare possit prefatum Ricardum dictos custodes ad nostrum mandatum sibi assignasse et ipsum dicto Nicholao taliter adhesisse et partem aliquam terrarum suarum eidem vendidisse, tunc prefato Roberto et fratribus suis filiis ipsius Simonis, qui custodes eiusdem per prefatum Ricardum, vt predictum est, fuerant deputati, statum suum prefatum illius custodie habere faciatis. Et si quid de terris et tenementis ipsius Simonis a tempore quo prefatus Ricardus huiusmodi custodes sibi deputauit alienatum fuerit, id in manum nostram capi et dictis custodibus liberari faciatis, donec super hoc facto plenius fuerimus certiorati, seu aliud inde de nostro consilio duxerimus ordinandum. Teste Rege apud Xantonem¹ xv. die Septembris anno etc. xiiij.

Cum vero predictus Robertus in Angliam rediisset, audiuit quod predictus dominus Nicolaus quemdam finem inter eum et prefatum Simonem de predicto manerio coram predictis iusticiariis leuare nitebatur, propter quod prefatus accessit coram prefatis iusticiariis, et finem illum de die in diem calumpniabat, et breue domini Regis predictis iusticiariis ostendit, et coram eis legi fecit. Gilbertus eciam de Thorntone qui tunc sequebatur pro Rege finem predictum pro statu domini Regis calumpniabat. Nichilominus cum predicti iusticiarii, non obstante calumpnia predictorum Roberti et Gilberti, et eciam non obstante breui predicto, finem illum coram eis inter predictum Simonem et Nicholaum leuari permiserunt, in domini Regis contemptum et predicti Roberti exheredacionem et dampnum . . . librarum : et de hoc petit remedium etc.

Et quia auditores voluerunt certiorari si predictus Ricardus de Holebroke ad mandatum domini Regis custodiam corporis et terrarum dicti Simonis predicto Roberto et fratribus suis tradidisset, vt predictus Robertus dicit, fecerunt predictum Ricardum de Holebroke venire coram eis. Qui bene recordatus est quod ad mandatum domini Regis accessit ad partes illas et de statu predicti Simonis per bonos et legales de comitatu illo et de comitatu Cantebrie inquisiuit : per quam quidem inquisitionem inuenit predictum Simonem per multa tempora ante mentis sue inmemorem extitisse, et adhuc tunc erat : vnde secundum tenorem mandati predicti, custodiam corporis et terrarum predicti Simonis simul cum bonis et catallis suis predicto Roberto et fratribus suis

¹ Saintes, dep. Charente-Inférieure.

commisit: set requisitus si warantum suum ibidem habeat per quod custodiam illam predicto Roberto et fratribus suis tradidit, dicit quod non. Ideo preceptum est ei quod habeat inde warantum suum hic in octabis sancte Trinitatis. Ad quem diem non venit nec warantum predictum protulit. Ideo preceptum est ei per breue Regis quod habeat predictum warantum hic a die sancti Michaelis in vnum mensem anno regni regis Edwardi xviii^o. finiente. Ad quem diem predictus Ricardus venit coram predictis auditoribus, et warantum suum protulit in hec verba:

‘Edwardus etc. dilecto et fideli suo Ricardo de Holebroke senescallo suo, salutem. Cum Simon de Stanton compos mentis sue non fuerit vt intelleximus, nos, statui et imbecillitate ipsius compacientes et sibi et heredibus suis providere cupientes, ne per ipsius fatuitatem per aliquorum insolenciam exheredacionis periculum sibi grauetur, vobis mandamus quod ipsum Simonem, cum terris, tenementis, bonis et catallis suis, alicui de fidelioribus parentibus seu amicis suis, de quo nulla suspicio poterit suspicari committatis, qui eum benigne tractare et de bonis suis, salua sustentacione sua et liberorum suorum, respondere voluerit, vt debebit. Teste me ipso apud Estwode¹ secundo die Augusti anno regni nostri [decimo] nono.’

Super hoc venit dominus Nicholaus de Segraue qui terras illas tenet, ducens secum dominum Galfridum Picheforde et Thomam de Belbus, quondam vicecomitem Cantebrigie, et dicit quod predictus Robertus et alii filii predicti Simonis eum bone memorie existentem apud Stanton in ferris detinuerunt et quod pro cupiditate hereditatis sue et bonorum suorum liberam sibi administracionem habere non permiserunt: quod cum curie domini Regis denunciatum esset, dominus Rex misit breue Galfrido de Pycheforde quod ipse vna cum vicecomite Cantebrigie et aliis legalibus de patria accederet ad domum predicti Simonis apud Stanton, et, si eum sane mentis et bone memorie inuenirent, liberam sibi administracionem bonorum suorum habere facerent etc.

Et predictus Galfridus requisitus per auditores si predictum breue recepit, et si predicto Simoni administracionem bonorum suorum tradidit vt predictus Nicholaus asserit, dicit quod predictum breue recepit, per cuius warantum, vna cum Thoma de Belbus, tunc vicecomite Cantebrigie, qui presens est et hoc idem asserit, et vna cum aliis legalibus de patria, ad domum predicti Simonis accessit

¹ Eastwood, Essex.

eumque in capella sua in ferris, sane mentis et bone memorie existentem inuenit, vnde eum a ferris deponi fecit et in aulam suam coram predicto vicecomite et aliis fidedignis duxit: coram quibus ad omnia interrogata bene et sapienter respondit et eos ad commestionem rogauit, et omnia alia sapienter loquebatur. Vnde quia videbatur predictis Galfrido vicecomiti et aliis predictum Simonem sane mentis esse, virtute waranti predicti liberam sibi administracionem bonorum suorum tradiderunt etc. Et predictus Galfridus, requisitus per auditores si predictum warantum hic habeat, dicit quod non: vnde dictum est ei quod habeat illud hic in octabis sancte Trinitatis etc. Ad quem diem predictus G. non venit, nec warantum predictum misit. Ideo preceptum est ei per breue Regis quod sit coram predictis auditoribus apud Westmonasterium a die sancti Michaelis in vnum mensem, et habeat ibi warantum predictum etc. Postea in crastino Ascensionis Domini venit predictus Galfridus et dicit quod ad deliberacionem illam faciendam habuit socium cui predictum mandatum venit simul cum eo, videlicet Thomam de Belhus tunc vicecomitem Cantebrigie, sine quo non potest inde respondere, et petit quod veniat hic ad respondendum simul cum eo de predicto waranto; et concessum est ei. Ideo preceptum est vicecomiti Essexie quod venire faciat predictum Thomam hic a die sancti Iohannis in xv. dies ad respondendum simul cum predicto Galfrido de predicto waranto. Super hoc venit Willelmus Ynge qui sequitur pro Rege, et queritur de predicto Galfrido de eo quod cum tenementa predicta essent in manu domini Regis, idem Galfridus predicta tenementa sine precepto domini Regis tradidit predicto Simoni ad dampnum predicti domini Regis mille librarum etc. Et Galfridus dicit quod Thomas de Belhus, tunc vicecomes Cantebrigie, fuit ei associatus ad predictam deliberacionem faciendam, sine quo non potest inde respondere, et petit quod veniat ad respondendum simul cum eo; et ei conceditur. Ideo preceptum est vicecomiti quod venire faciat predictum Thomam ad prefatum terminum etc.

Postea, a die sancti Iohannis Baptiste in xv. dies anno xix^o, venit predictus Galfridus et tulit predictis auditoribus breue domini Regis in hec verba:

‘Edwardus Dei gratia etc. venerabili in Christo patri I. eadem gratia Wyntoniensi Episcopo et sociis suis auditoribus querelarum, salutem. Cum nos diu ante vltimam transfretacionem nostram in Vasconiam dilecto et fideli nostro Galfrido de Picheforde mandaueri-

mus quod ipse in propria persona sua ad Simonem de Stantonem accederet et diligenter ac diuersimodo secum tractaret ad videndum vtrum esset compos mentis sue necne, et nichilominus per sacramentum proborum et legalium hominum de comitatu Huntingdonie, quo idem Simon moram tunc fecerat, per quos rei veritas melius sciri posset de statu eiusdem Simonis inquireret et inquisitionem inde distincte et aperte factam nobis sub sigillo suo et sigillis eorum per quos facta esset nobis mitteret: et idem Galfridus, habito cum prefato Simone super hoc diligenti tractatu, et nichilominus facta inde predicta inquisitione, ipsum a vinculis quibus dicta occasione ligatus fuerat tanquam sanum et sue mentis compotem l[iberare] fecerit: Robertus filius et heres predicti Simonis asserens predictum Galfridum premissa absque mandato nostro fecisse, ipsum G. coram vobis ea de causa implacitat in ipsius Galfridi dispendium non modicum et grauamen. Et quia de transgressionibus et querelis coram vobis audiendis et terminandis post predictam vltimam transfretacionem nostram vsque aduentum nostrum in partibus Anglie et non vltra secundum formam vobis inde traditam habetis intromittere, vobis mandamus quod si vobis constare possit quod predictus Galfridus premissa fecerit ante predictam transfretacionem tunc de placito illo coram vobis vltius tenendo vos non intromittentes, districciones et exacciones si quas eidem Galfrido dicta occasione seu pro aliqua defalta per ipsum Galfridum in eadem loquela coram vobis facta feceritis, sine dilatione relaxetis eidem. Teste me ipso apud Norham¹ xvij. die Iunii anno Regis nunc xix^o.

Et quia predicti auditores voluerunt certiorari si calumpnia predicti Gilberti de Thorntone pro Rege, et calumpnia predicti Roberti coram prefatis iuratoribus inrotulata essent vt debebat, fecerunt scrutari rotulos predicti itineris in quibus nichil inuenitur de calumpnia predicta nisi concordia inter predictos Simonem et Nicholaum facta in hec verba:

‘Placita coram I. de Vallibus etc. in comitatu Huntingdonie in crastino sancti Michaelis anno xiiij^o. etc. Nicholaus de Segraue dat quadraginta solidos pro licencia concordandi cum Simone de Stantonem de placito waranti carte et habent cirographum etc.’

Et predictus Willelmus de Saham venit, et ad querelam predicti Roberti dicit quod quando idem Robertus alias in itinere suo

Responsio
Willelmi de
Saham.

¹ Norham, near Berwick-on-Tweed.

obiecit eidem Nicholao quod [concordia ista] transire non potuit nec debuit leuari de predictis tenementis inter ipsum et predictum Simonem eo quod predictus Simon non fuit com[positus mentis, et] Gilbertus de Thorntone qui tunc sequebatur pro Rege hoc idem allegauit coram eo et sociis suis sedentibus in itinere predicto, asser[ens predictum Simonem esse] mentis sue inmemorem, eo quod idem Simon multociens nudus gladio cinctus dominas illius patrie visitabat et mul[ta alia fecit que] homines huiusmodi morbi vicissim grauati facere solebant. Et sic audita et intellecta calumpnia ipsius Gilberti [iusticiarii] . . . supersederunt, et amplius inde vice illa facere noluerunt: per quod idem Nicholaus adiuit dominum Edmundum C[omit]em Cornubie et duxit] prefatum Simonem vsque ad scaccarium domini Regis apud Westmonasterium, in quo quidem scaccario idem Simon examinatus fuit, [coram] et aliis de consilio domini Regis, quibus videbatur ipsum Simonem esse in omnibus sufficientem huiusmodi recog[nicionem facere. Et dicit quod] Iohannes de Metyngham fuit sibi associatus in itinere predicto ad placita ibidem audienda et terminanda [sine quo non potest] respondere, et petit quod ipse veniat ad respondendum simul etc.

Postea venit predictus Iohannes et requisitus si interfuit predicto placito simul cum predicto Willelmo; qui dicit quod ipse tenebat placita domini Regis quo waranto in quadam domo vbi predictus Willelmus non interfuit; vnde videtur ei [quod non debet respondere] cum predicto Willelmo. Dicit eciam quod idem Willelmus respondit per se ad capitale placitum predictum vnde videtur [quod non debet] de cetero admitti ad aliquam responsionem dilatoriam etc. Preterea predictus Robertus requisitus a pre[dicto utrum velit] versus ipsum prosequi, vel in aliquo conqueri, dicit quod non, quia dicit quod idem Iohannes tunc [non fuit cum] . . . predicto Willelmo ad predictum placitum audiendum etc. Vnde postea venit predictus Willelmus per attornatum suum, et dicit quod predictum finem leuauit per examinacionem predictam, et de precepto predicti Comitis Cornubie, et de hoc vocat recordum ipsius Comitis ad warantum. Ideo mandatum est eidem Comiti quod recordum suum super hoc distincte et aperte faciat et idem recordum mittat hic in crastino [Animarum] sub sigillo suo etc. Ad quem diem venerunt predicti Robertus et Willelmus per attornatum suum et predicto Willelmo requisito si habeat recordum predicti Comitis [quod voc]auit, dicit quod non. Et predictus Robertus petiit

iudicium de predicto Willelmo de eo quod non habet recordum predicti Comititis.

: : : : : : : :
: : : : : : : :

Three lines
missing.

Et predictus [Robertus de custodia] corporis et terrarum predicti Simonis depositus fuit et vsque ad mortem predicti Simonis extra seysinam de predictis tenementis remansit et adhuc est, ad dampnum domini Regis mille librarum etc. vnde petit iudicium pro Rege. Et dies datus est partibus de audiendo iudicio suo hic in crastino sancti Andree etc. Ad quem diem dominus Rex misit auditoribus quoddam breue in hec verba :

m. 19 d.

‘Edwardus Dei gratia etc. dilectis et fidelibus suis I. Wyn-toniensi Episcopo et sociis suis auditoribus querelarum, salutem. Cum quidam finis in curia nostra coram Iohanne de Vallibus et sociis suis iusticiariis nostris vltimo itinerantibus in comitatu Huntingdonie inter Nicholaum de Segraue seniore et Simonem de Stantone de quibusdam terris et tenementis que predictus Simon habuit in Stantone et Hyltone,¹ vnde idem Simon prefatum Nicholaum feoffauit et ipsum in bona et pacifica seisinā posuit, leuatus fuisset, ac vos ad querelam Roberti filii predicti Simonis suggerentis vobis predictum finem coram predictis iusticiariis minus rite fuisse leuatum, ad querelam eiusdem Roberti dilectum et fidelem nostrum Iohannem de Metingham et Willelmum de Saham et socios suos iusticiarios nostros in itinere predicto ea occasione multipliciter inquietare feceritis coram vobis. Nos indempnitati prefati Nicholai, qui per preceptum nostrum in partibus Scotie in obsequio nostro moram facit, hiis diebus ex quo dictum negocium ipsum tangit prospicere cupientes, in hac parte vobis mandamus quod discussioni predictę querele coram vobis supersedeatis omnino donec aliud inde precepimus. Teste me ipso apud Berewyke super Twedam xiiij^o die Augusti anno regni nostri decimonono.’

Propter quod quidem breue predicta querela remansit sine die etc.

¹ Hilton, Hunts, south of Fenstanton.

16

Defendants.—Ralph de Sandwich, Keeper of the Tower;
Gregory de Rokesle, Keeper of the Exchange; John
de Bakewell.

Complainant.—Hugh le Taylor.

Reference to extract.—Membrane 31.

No other references.

Number of case in Appendix III., 150.

Lond.
m. 31.

Hugo le Tayllur queritur de Radulfo de Sandewyco custode Turris Londonie, Gregorio de Rokesle, et Iohanne de Bauquelle, quod cum Iacobus de Bello Campo portasset quoddam breue coram custode predicto quod predictus Hugo redderet ei quoddam scriptum de sex saccis lane precio sacce xiiij. marcarum, vnde Normannus de Arcy aliquo tempore tenebatur mercatoribus de Florencia, et dominus Comes Lincolnie inde pr[imus] et principalis debitor, ac idem Iacobus in suo acusamento¹ dixisset quod illud scriptum traditum fuit eidem Hugoni per manum Simonis de Ellesworde persone ecclesie de Trapestone,² ac idem Hugo respondisset per narratorem suum quod vbi Iacobus dicit quod scriptum illud traditum fuit predicto Hugoni per manum predicti Simonis et nichil profert in curia per quod predictum scriptum posset petere desicut debitum illud non fuit ei debitum nec scriptum illud per manum suam ei traditum: vnde idem Hugo petiit iudicium si predicto Iacobo inde deberet respondere: iidem custos, Gregorius, et Iohannes super hoc considerauerunt quod predictus Hugo vlterius inde responderet ac idem Hugo predictam considerationem percipiens iniquam, petiit inde billam vel quod predicta exceptio irrotularetur, set nichil inde voluerunt concedere set fecerunt ipsum vlterius placitare. Preterea vbi prefatus Hugo paratus fuit verificare quod predictus Iacobus nullum scriptum ei tradidit, predictus custos et alii adiudicarunt quod predictus Iacobus illam tradicionem probaret per duos homines quod est contrarium legi communi. Preterea vbi predicti custos et alii considerauerunt quod predictus Iacobus recuperaret versus ipsum Hugonem predictum scriptum vel xx. et iij. marcas, predictus

¹ MS. acupamento.

² Thrapston, Northants.

Hugo queritur quod in hoc erratum fuit desicut predictus Iacobus nichil habuit per quod argentum petere potuit. Preterea predictus Hugo paratus est verificare per predictum Normannum qui debitum illud debuit, et per Thomam de Arcy qui interfuit solutioni illius, quod predictum debitum predictis mercatoribus plenarie est solutum. Ista iniuste eidem Hugoni per prefatos custodem et alios facta sunt; ad dampna ipsius Hugonis C. librarum etc.

Et predictus custos et alii veniunt et dicunt quod breue illud per quod predictus Hugo implacitabatur directum fuit vicecomitibus Londonie, sine quibus non possunt respondere nec sine aldermannis per quos iudicia in Londonia redduntur. Ideo preceptum est custodi quod venire faciat hic coram auditoribus, vicecomites et aldermannos in octabis sancti Martini. Ad quem diem veniunt tam predicti vicecomites et aldermanni quam predicti custos, Gregorius, Iohannes et Hugo. Et predicti aldermanni dicunt pro se et aliis quod habent libertatem a dominis Regibus pro se et pro communitate ciuitatis Londonie, quod non debent respondere super aliqua re nisi infra quatuor muros ciuitatis predictae. Vnde dicunt quod non debent respondere nisi coram auditoribus ad querelas ministrorum infra ciuitatem audiendas assignatis. Et quia auditores nolunt preiudicare libertatibus predictae ciuitati concessis, dictum est predicto custodi et aliis quod expectent diem suum ad Gwyhaldam.¹ Et mandatum est predicto custodi et vicecomitibus quod mittant recordum predictae loquela coram eis ad prefatum diem. Ad quem diem veniunt ibi prefati custos et aldermanni et propter alia negocia ardua, continuatus est dies vsque a die Purificacionis in tres septimanas, et interim ad petitionem utriusque partis, videlicet Hugonis et Radulfi, datus est eis dies a die Purificacionis beate Marie in tres septimanas coram auditoribus infra ciuitatem assignatis, et associatus est eis Elyas de Bekyngham ad predictam querelam audiendam. Et mandatum est predictis custodi et vicecomitibus quod mittant prefatum recordum coram eis ad prefatum diem etc. Ad quem diem predicti custos et vicecomites miserunt recordum suum. Et Elyas de Bekyngham associatus predictis auditoribus venit. Et quia Ricardus de Holebroke vnus auditorum ciuitatis predictae fuit infirmus, Bogo de Cnouille consocius suus et predictus Elyas ei associatus ad predictas loquelas audiendas noluerunt

¹ The Guildhall.

procedere.¹ Postea assignati sunt pro auditoribus Elyas de Bekyng-
ham et Willelmus de Gyselham ad audiendos predictam loquelam
ad certos dies etc. infra ciuitatem predictam.

17

Defendant.—Thomas de Sedgelyeld.

Complainant.—Robert Herizarde.

Reference to manuscript.—B., Membrane 44d.

No other references.

Number of case in Appendix III., 152.

Mid^d. Lond.
44d.

Robertus Herizarde queritur de magistro Thoma de Segefeld²
de eo quod cum ipse fuisset in obsequio domini Regis coram
auditoribus suis querelarum apud Westmonasterium ad communem
populum deliberandum prout ad officium clerici pertinet, idem
Thomas ipsum verbis contumeliosis insultauit, appellando ipsum
falsum clericum et dicendo quod falso inrotulauit querelam suam
factam de Radulfo de Hengham. Et similiter quod fecit alia falsa
inrotulamenta ad dampnum ipsius Roberti centum librarum etc.
Et magister Thomas venit et bene defendit quod nunquam ipsum
appellauit falsum clericum, nec crimen ei inposuit prout queri-
tur, et hoc petit quod inquiratur per patriam etc. [Et] Robertus
[similiter]. Iuratores de consensu parcium electi dicunt super
sacramentum suum quod magister Thomas vocauit predictum
Robertum falsum clericum, dicendo quod falso inrotulauit querelam
suam versus Radulfum de H[engham] simul cum aliis falsis inrotu-
lamentiis. Et quia compertum est per eandem iuratam quod idem
[magister] Thomas vocauit ipsum Robertum falsum clericum in
loco pupplico et solempni dum fuit in obsequio domini Regis,
inponendo ei falsitatem predictam, ideo consideratum est quod
predictus magister Thomas [committatur] gaole. Et postea fecit
finem cum eodem Roberto de vno dolio vini precii . . .

Gaola.

¹ Walter de Hopton had formerly been Cnoveille's colleague: and, later, Peter de Campania and John de Cadamo were associated with him (*C.P.R.*, 1281-1292, pp. 353, 513).

² Sedgelyeld, Durham. It is possible that the real form is Sheffield.

18

Defendant.—Nicholas de Stapleton.

Complainants.—Thomas de Goldington, Amice his wife.

Reference to manuscript.—B., Membranes 17, 17d.

Other references.—None.

Number of case in Appendix III., 158.

Ostensum est nobis per Thomam de Goldington et Amiciam vxorem eius quod Iohannes filius Willelmi le Fraunceys de Mebrunmalde,¹ Robertus le Lune de eodem, Walterus de Caldebecke,² Ricardus de Fodringeseghe,³ Galfridus de Wassedale⁴ et Robertus de Appelby⁵ venerunt de manerio domini Ricardi le Fraunceys de Mebrunmalde apud Crosseby Rauenswart⁶ ad manerium Thome de Hastings fratris eiusdem Amicie, per preceptum domini Ricardi le Fraunceys, die Pentecostes anno regni Regis Edwardi xiii., et insultum fecerunt in Nicholaum fratrem dicte Amicie et percusserunt eum gladiis et baculis suis vsque ad sanguinis effusionem. Et postmodum Iohannes le Fraunceys precepit predicto Roberto de Appelby quod eum sagittaret, qui quidem Robertus ipsum Nicholaum sagittauit cum quadam sagitta barbata per medium corpus supra mamillam dextram, ita quod statim obiit. Et postquam dicti felones istud facinus fecerint, omnes recesserunt ad manerium dicti Ricardi le Fraunceys apud Mebrunmalde et ipsum Robertum, qui percussit dictum Nicholaum cum sagitta, dicti felones per quatuor dies receptauerunt subsequentes. Et postea dicti felones appellabantur in curia domini Regis per Adam Spring, consanguineum dicti Nicholai, set illud appellum quassatum fuit eo quod dictus Nicholaus occisus habuit fratres propinquiores sanguine et sorores: set ad sectam domini Regis directa fuit littera domini Regis per preceptum Radulfi de Hengham Nicholao de Stapeltone vt ipse caperet inquisitionem in comitatu Westmorelandie de bonis et fidelibus non tangentibus dictos felones consanguinitate vel affinitate. Set idem Nicholaus de Stapeltone ad instanciam domini Michaelis de Hercle, cuius

Westmore-
land.
m. 17.

¹ Meaburn Maulds.

² Caldbeck.

³ Fotheringhay.

⁴ Wastdale.

⁵ Appleby.

⁶ Crosby Ravensworth.

filiam dictus Ricardus le Fraunceys duxit in vxorem, et ad instanciam Ade le Fraunceys persone ecclesie de Askeby¹ consanguinei predicti Ricardi, et pro magnis donis dicto Nicholao de Stapeltone traditis, cepit inquisitionem illam clam apud Nouum Castrum² in comitatu Northumbrie, qui distat a comitatu Westmorelandie per sexaginta leucas vbi illud facinus factum fuit. Et hoc contra legem et consuetudinem regni quia extra comitatum Westmorelandie. Et hec inquisicio facta fuit de affinibus et consanguineis dictorum felonum in absencia amicorum dicti occisi qui pro Rege sequebantur, et qui si premuniti fuissent potuissent dictam inquisitionem calumpniasse. Vnde ostensum est quod dicta inquisicio dixit quod dicti appellati fuerunt quieti de illa morte. Vnde ostensum est per predictos Thomam et Amiciam quod Iohannes le Fraunceys, qui principalis fuit illius homicidii, implacitauit predictam Amiciam et alios fratres et sorores dicti Nicholai de falso abbetto coram Radulfo de Hengham. Et vnde dicta Amicia queritur quod per expensa et labores quos per predictum abbettum sustinuit deteriorata est, et dampnum habet ad valenciam ducentarum librarum etc.

Et Nicholaus venit per attornatum suum et dicit quod postquam appellum de morte predicta cassatum fuit, et prostratum coram Radulfo de Hengham per iudicium et ad sectam Regis, postea partes se in inquisitionem inde posuerint, ordinatum fuit per concilium Regis quod pro aysiamiento iuratorum qui fuerunt tam longinqui, predictus Nicholaus patriam illam adiret in qua felonia facta fuit, et ibidem inquisitionem inde caperet. Et idem Nicholaus, itinerando versus patriam graui infirmitate detentus, non potuit vlterius proficisci, set inquisitionem illam cepit apud Castrum Nouum modo debito et iuste.

Et Amicia venit et dicit quod quando predictus Nicholaus inquisitionem illam cepit, ipse fuit in bono statu, sanus, et nulla infirmitate detentus. Dicit eciam quod inquisitionem illam per quosdam de consanguinitate et affinitate malefactorum predictorum cepit extra comitatum illum in quo felonia illa perpetrata fuit, sicut queritur, et hoc ratione donorum que a prefatis malefactoribus recepit: videlicet: decem marcarum quas recepit apud Nouum Castrum per manum Michaelis de Harcla: nec premunire fecit aliquos qui sequebantur pro Rege quod essent ibi ad illum diem.

¹ Asby, Westmoreland.

² Newcastle-on-Tyne.

Et hoc parata est verificare per quod curia considerauerit, et per recordum et processum iusticiariorum quos profert in hec verba:

This record
not printed;

Et Nicholaus venit et dicit quod nunquam cepit de predictis felonibus nec de amicis predictorum felonum decem marcas, nec magis nec minus [sicut] Amicia ei imponit. Et hoc petit quod inquiratur. Et predicta Amicia similiter petit quod inquiratur per comitatum Cumbrie et [Northumbrie], et hoc conceditur quia secta fit pro Rege. Ideo preceptum est vicecomiti Northumbrie quod venire faciat hic a die sancti Michaelis in vnum mensem, nisi nos prius etc., tot et tales etc., tam milites etc., per quos etc., ad certificandum etc., si iuratores supra in recordo nominati fuerunt predictis appellatis consanguinitate vel affinitate coniuncti, vel aliqua alia causa predicto interfecto suspecti quare predicta inquisicio minus iuste capta fuit etc. Et si predicti Iohannes, Robertus, Walterus, Ricardus, Galfridus et Robertus de morte predicti Nicholai de facto et predictus Ricardus le Fraunceys de precepto et receptamento fuerunt culpabiles, necne. Et si predictus Nicholaus de Stapeltone aliqua dona de predictis appellatis vel eorum amicis recepit vt predictam inquisitionem extra comitatum in quo feloniam illa facta fuit caperet etc., necne. Et si Thomas de Goldyngtone et Amicia vxor eius, qui pro nobis et se ipsis sequuntur in absentia sua, false et maliciose per predictam inquisitionem facti fuerunt abbettores etc. Similiter preceptum est vicecomiti Westmorlandie¹ et Cumbrie quod venire faciant etc. tot et tales etc., et quod venire faciant iuratores in predicta inquisitione nominatos ad prefatum terminum etc. Ad quem diem predicti Thomas et Amicia per attornatum suum venerunt. Et optulerunt se versus predictum Nicholaum coram auditoribus apparentem. Et vicecomes Northumbrie nichil fecit, nec breue misit. Ideo ipse² in misericordia, et sicut prius preceptum est vicecomiti quod venire faciat hic a die sancti Hillarii in xv. dies tot et tales etc. per quos etc. ad certificandum etc. Et vicecomes sit etc. et similiter fiat breue coronatoribus Northumbrie quod venire faciant hic predictum vicecomitem ad prefatum terminum ad respondendum etc. Et iuratores in predicta inquisitione nominati³ non venerunt. Ideo

m. 17d

¹ MS. Westmerlandie.

² MS. ipsie.

³ MS. nominatos.

preceptum est vicecomiti Westmorelandie quod distringat eos per omnes terras etc. et quod de exitibus etc. Et quod habeat corpora ad eundem terminum etc.

Cumb[ria].

Iurata de comitatu Cumbrie inter Thomam de Goldington et Amiciam uxorem eius, qui pro Rege et seipsis sequuntur, querentes, et Nicholaum de Stapleton, defendentem, ponitur in respectum vsque a die sancti Hillarii in xv. dies eo quod nullus iurator venit. Ideo vicecomes distringat eos per omnes terras etc. Et de exitibus. Et habeat corpora etc. ad prefatum terminum etc. Ad quem diem venerunt iuratores inquisitionis que capta fuit coram predicto Nicholao apud Nouum Castrum super Tynam, exceptis Roberto de Moreuille qui mortuus est, Rolando de Thorneburghe, Willelmo de Tyle et Ricardo de Prestone. Et quia ad sectam Regis tantum venerunt, et predictus Nicholaus a domino Rege quietam clamanciam de omnimodis accionibus quas dominus Rex erga eum posset habere occasione quarumcumque transgressionum impetrauit per cartam domini Regis, quam proferebat in hac forma :

‘Edwardus Dei gratia etc. omnibus ad quos presentes littere peruenerint salutem. Sciatis quod per finem trescentarum marcarum quem Nicholaus de Stapeltone miles fecit nobiscum, vnde soluet nobis centum marcas in quindena sancti Martini proxima futura, et centum marcas in quindena Pasche proxima sequenti, et residuas centum marcas in quindena sancti Michaelis proxima sequenti, remisimus et pardonauimus eidem Nicholao omnimodam accionem quam erga ipsum habuimus vel habere poterimus occasione quarumcumque transgressionum quas nobis fecisse dicebatur de toto tempore quo stetit in obsequio nostro usque ad diem Lune in festo sancti Michaelis in Monte Tumba anno regni nostri decimo octauo. Ita quod omnibus et singulis de regno et potestate nostra de ipso conquerentibus et in posterum conqueri volentibus respondeat, et stet iuri in omnibus vt tenetur. In cuius rei testimonium has litteras nostras fieri fecimus patentes. Teste me ipso apud Kyngeselipestone ¹ quinto decimo die octobris anno regni nostri decimo octauo.’

Ideo dictum est predictis iuratoribus quod eant sine die quousque Rex aliud voluerit. Et dictum est predicto Thome quod expectet etc.

¹ Clipstone, Notts.

19

Defendant.—Adam de Stratton, chamberlain of the Exchequer.

Complainant.—Peter de Cropredy.

Reference to manuscript.—B., Membrane 13.

Other references.—B., Membranes 1, 3, 4, 13.

Number of case in Appendix III., 159.

Petrus de Croppery¹ queritur de Adam de Stratton quod cum ipse Petrus tenebatur comitis de Alba Mara² in quater viginti et quatuordecim libris, per quod idem Petrus adiuit predictum Adam, qui fuit attornatus predictae comitis ad recipiendum predictum debitum, et supplicauit ei vt constitueret ei certos terminos infra quos idem Petrus eidem Ade predictum debitum potuit soluere: qui quidem Adam ei concessit terminum quatuor annorum, per hoc quod idem Petrus faceret Simonem fratrem suum recognoscere ipsum coram baronibus de scaccario teneri predictae comitis in predicto debito: qui quidem Simon ibi venit et predictum debitum recognouit, que quidem recognicio irrotulata fuit: ac idem Adam concessit eidem Petro ante predictam recognicionem factam quod alios plegios a predicto Petro non peteret quam predictum Simonem; per quod predictus Simon predictum debitum recognouit; predictus Adam statim post predictam recognicionem sic factam petiit de predicto Petro quod quereretur sibi alios plegios; idem Petrus percipiens hoc venire fecit quemdam Iohannem Paynel et quemdam Benedictum de Hanuile qui pro predicto Petro predictam recognicionem fecerunt. Postea, idem Petrus intelligens quod terminus solucionis infra quatuor annos prout inter eos conuenit esset irrotulatus, predictus Adam incontinenti fecit exire breve de scaccario ad leuandum predictum debitum de predicto Petro et plegiis suis: vnde idem Petrus terram suam non potuit arrare neque seminare quousque predictum debitum esset solutum, per quod predictus Petrus vendidit tres carucas terre ad maximam exheredacionem suam et suorum. Et vnde queritur quod cum idem Petrus totum debitum illud predicto Ade persoluerat, et inde de eo bonam habuit acquietanciam, idem Adam misit pro predicto Petro vt veniret coram eo in capella

North.
M. 13.

¹ Cropredy, Oxfordshire.

² Isabella de Fors, countess of Albemarle.

recepti apud Westmonasterium : qui quidem Petrus venit et cum eo predictus Simon, tunc presente ibi Willelmo fratre predicti Ade : qui quidem Willelmus incontinenti clausit ostium predictæ capelle et ibi ipsum detinuit quo minus clamorem leuare potuit ; ac idem Adam petiit de predicto Petro quod monstraret ei acquietanciam suam ; inde predictus Petrus acquietanciam suam ei porrexit ; quam cum idem Adam habuisset, sigilla ei pendencia statim fregit et proiecit in Tamisiam. Et recognicio quam predictus Simon et plegii sui fecerunt adhuc non fuit cancellata, set tunc fuit et adhuc est in eodem statu in quo fuit die recognitionis facte. Unde idem Petrus inde petit remedium. Et quod predictum debitum amplius non veniat in demandam.

Preterea antequam idem Iohannes Paynel voluit recognoscere predictum debitum pro ipso Petro ad scaccarium, predictus Iohannes fecit predictos Petrum et Simonem obligari ei per statutum editum apud Actone Burnel¹ in eodem debito et vnuquam inde vol[uit] predictam recognitionem retrahere quousque haberet de eo acquietanciam de predicta acquietancia, et quia vicecomes Norhamtonie fecit de eo quinque marcas per breue de scaccario quod venit ei per predictum Adam, predictus Iohannes fecit predictum Petrum [imprisonari] per predictum statutum in Norhamptonie in castello, vbi predictus Petrus tenebatur in carcere per decem septimanas quousque [solvit] predictas quinque marcas, vnde vocat in testimonium Robertum le Baude, qui tunc fuit vicecomes : ad dampnum ipsius [Petri] c. librarum etc.

Et Willelmus de Stratton venit et dicit quod nunquam ipsum Petrum in predicta capella cepit nec detinuit nec imprisonauit [sicut idem] Petrus queritur, et hoc petit quod inquiratur per ministros recepti qui tunc temporis fuerunt, et per alios liberos et legales homines de v[isneto pall]acii. Et predictus Petrus similiter. Ideo preceptum est Iohanni le Conuers, custodi pallacii, quod venire faciat hic die Iouis proxima post quindenam . . . ministros [recepti] et preter illos xij. liberos et legales de visneto pallacii ad certificandum etc. Quia tam etc. Postea ad predictum diem venerunt [dicti] Petrus et Willelmus et iuratores similiter. Qui dicunt super sacramentum suum quod predictus Willelmus nunquam ipsum Petrum in predicta c[apella cepit] nec detinuit, seu imprisonauit, nec aliquid scriptum ipsius Petri fregit, nec in Tamisiam proiecit, nec ali[quam]

¹ Statute de Mercatoribus, or of Acton Burnell, Salop (1283).

... iniuriam ei fecit. Ideo consideratum est quod predictus Willelmus eat inde quietus et predictus Petrus pro sua falsa querela [sit in misericordia]. Et quia predictus Adam residet in prisiona domini Regis apud turrin Londonie et ibi commissus fuit per consilium curie domini Regis [pro diver]sis transgressionibus, remanet loquela ista in eodem statu etc. vsque idem Adam venire possit etc. Postea . . . per breue Regis, et per attornatum suum per breue Regis quoad recognicionem predictarum quater viginti et xiiij. librarum per ipsum Petrum et Simonem fratrem suum eidem comitis in scaccario factam, bene cognouit quod predictus [Petrus] fecit cognicionem de xl. et vij. libris eidem comitis in termino sancti Hillarii anno regni nunc xiiij^o. Et postea Simon frater ipsius Petri recognouit alias xl. et vij. libras de residuo predicti debiti quater viginti et quatuordecim librarum, et quod predictum debitum ad sectam ipsius Ade quasi attornati ipsius comitis leuatum fuit. Et [quoad di]lacionem etc. litterarum de aquietancia ipsius Petri, dicit predictus Adam per attornatum suum quod predictas [litteras de] aquietancia nunquam fregit, nec in Tamisiam proiecit, nec predictas aquietancias ab eo abstulit. [Et] petit quod inquiratur per patriam. Et Petrus similiter. Ideo preceptum est vicecomiti quod venire faciat hic [a die sancti] Iohannis Baptiste in xv. dies xxiiij. tam milites quam alios etc. de visneto Westmonasterii et crucis lapidee. Et qui nec etc. ad recognoscendum Midā. [etc.] tam etc. Postea a die sancti Iohannis Baptiste in xv. dies venerunt predicti Petrus et Adam per attornatum suum et iuratores, [qui] dicunt super sacramentum suum quod predictus Adam nunquam aliquas litteras ipsius Petri de aquietanciis cepit, nec eas fregit, nec [in Ta]misiam iecit, nec predictum Adam ea ratione seu alia per medium dicte ville cum huthesio prosequabatur sicut queritur. Ideo con[sideratum est quod] predictus Adam eat inde quietus, et predictus Petrus nichil capiet per querelam suam, set sit in misericordia pro falsa querela. . . .

Idem Petrus queritur de predicto Ada quod cum idem Petrus cepisset de eo quandam ecclesiam ad firmam pro [xl. marcis, et dedisset] ei plegios, videlicet dominum Nicholaum de Wythlmenhale et Simonem de Hanytone, idem Petrus [ad terminum assig]natum prout inter eos conuenit, venit ad predictum Adam, et ei soluit predictas xl. marcas, idem Adam [nullam acquietanciam ei] fecit, set tamen de plegiis predicti Petri leuari fecit alias xl. marcas per breue domini Regis vicecomiti [Northamtonie directum]

ipsorum, et super hoc idem Adam recepit de catallis ipsius Petri ad valenciam x. marcarum, ad dampnum ipsius Petri Preterea idem Petrus queritur de predicto Adam quod idem Adam in aula Westmonasterii inuenit Willelmum filium [qui de]bebat eidem Petro viij. libras xvj. solidos, et Laurencium de Stretforde, qui debebat eidem . . . [et compulsit eos omnia] ei soluere per distraccionem et eis nullam acquietanciam inde voluit facere, ad dampnum [ipsius Petri] . . . [Et postea predictus] Adam per diuersa breuia de scaccario fecit distringi predictum Petrum. Ita quod predictus [Petrus] . . . [ad maximam] exheredacionem suam et dampnum etc.

Et Adam venit et dicit quod dimisit ecclesiam¹ illam predicto Petro ad firmam. . . .

Thirty-three
lines illegible.

.
.
.
.

m. 13

habet.

Et quoad catalla ipsius Petri, videlicet meremium et vtensilia domus ad valenciam x. marcarum quas idem Adam cepisse debuit et detinuisse, dicit predictus Adam per attornatum suum quod nunquam meremium nec aliqua alia bona et catalla ipsius Petri per ipsum Adam nec per ballium suum capta fuerunt nec detenta, nec ad commodum ipsius Ade alio modo iniuste deuenerunt : et hoc petit quod inquiratur per patriam, et Petrus similiter. Ideo preceptum est vicecomiti quod venire faciat a die sancti Iohannis Baptiste in xv. dies xxiiij. tam milites quam alios etc. de visneto de Suwelle per quos etc. Et qui nec etc. ad recognoscendum etc. Quia tam etc. Postea a die sancti Iohannis Baptiste anno xx. veniunt predicti Petrus et Adam per attornatum suum et iuratores similiter ; qui dicunt super sacramentum suum quod nulla de predictis bonis Petri de Croppery ad opus predicti Ade nec ad comodum suum deuenerunt, nisi quedam cista vacua quam quidem seruans ipsius Ade habuit ex liberatione et voluntate dicti Petri, et quod predictus Adam nunquam bona et catalla ipsius Petri cepit, sicut idem Petrus queritur. Et quoad meremium, dicunt quod magister Radulfus de

¹ This is apparently the church of 'Suwelle in comitatu Norhamtonie mentioned later. There is no parish of Southwell in Northamptonshire ; possibly Southwick, near Oundle, is meant.

Iuvingho pro domibus et cancello ecclesie de Sutwelle deterioratis in custodia magistri Radulfi tanquam firmarii finem fecit cum predicto Ada per xxiiij. marcas; que quidem pecunia tradita fuit cuidam Petro de Middelstone, qui ex ea pecunia meremium predictum emit, et illud tradidit predicto Petro de Croppery ad cancellum et domos predictas reparandos et sustentandos. Et dicunt precise quod predictum meremium non fuit predicti Petri de Croppery set prefati Ade de Strattonne, et ex proprio argento suo emptum. Ideo consideratum est quod predictus Adam eat inde quietus, et quod predictus Petrus nichil caperet per querelam suam set sit in misericordia pro falso clamio suo.

Et quoad xl. marcas de quibus idem Petrus queritur quod non habuit aquietanciam nec allocacionem, predictus Petrus requisitus per auditores cui et vbi soluit predictas xl. marcas, dicit quod soluit eas Willelmo de Strattonne fratri ipsius Ade apud Suwelle in comitatu Norhamtonie anno Regis nunc xiiij^{to}, et hoc paratus est verificare per patriam. Et Adam per attornatum suum dicit quod nullam solucionem fecit ibi eidem Willelmo nomine suo: et hoc petit quod inquiratur, et Petrus similiter. Ideo preceptum est vicecomiti quod venire faciat hic a die sancti Iohannis Baptiste in xv. dies xxiiij. tam milites quam alios etc. de visneto de Suwelle per quos etc. et qui nec etc. ad recognoscendum etc. quia tam etc. Postea a die sancti Iohannis Baptiste anno xx^o [veniunt] predicti Petrus et Adam per attornatum suum et iuratores similiter; qui dicunt super sacramentum suum quod predictus Petrus nunquam soluit eidem Willelmo predictas quadraginta marcas in villa de Suwelle, nec idem Willelmus eas ibi ab [eo] cepit, quia predictus Willelmus numquam predictam villam hucusque intrauit. Ideo consideratum est quod predictus Adam eat inde quietus [et] predictus Petrus nichil capiet per querelam suam, set sit in misericordia pro falso clamio suo.

20

Defendant.—Adam de Stratton, chamberlain of the Exchequer.

Complainant.—Roger Goodman of Bermondsey.

References to manuscript.—B., Membrane 11.

No other references.

Number of case in Appendix III., 160. .

Lond.
m. 11.

Rogerus Godman de Bermundseye queritur de Adam de Stratton quod cum idem Rogerus fuit in pace domini Regis apud Wydeforde¹ in comitatu Hertefordie transiens cum merchandisis suis die dominica proxima post festum sancte Fidis anno regni Regis nunc xv., predictus Adam fecit insidiari predicto Rogero, et de eo iniuste cepit et capere fecit per quemdam Iohannem de Berkynges, tunc senescallum eiusdem Ade, et per alios ignotos de familia sua duos equos, videlicet vnum equum morellum precii septem librarum tresdecim solidorum et quatuor denariorum, et vnum equum bayum precii quatuor librarum, et predictos equos vi et contra pacem domini Regis abduxerunt de eadem villa vsque ad ciuitatem Londonie ad hospicium tunc predicti Ade. Et cum idem Rogerus recenter sequebatur predictos equos quousque eos inueniebat in stabulo predicti Ade, et mandasset eidem Ade per duos legales homines quod scire faceret ei quare equos suos sic detinuit, idem Adam respondit et dixit quod predictus Rogerus fuit natiuus suus fugitivus et quod nunquam equos suos haberet quousque finivisset cum eo decem libras. Et predictus Rogerus dixit quod nichil clamat tenere de eo, nec quod ipse nec vllus de antecessoribus suis natiuus suus fuit, nec de eo aliquid tenuerunt, per quod libere videbatur ei quod posset ire quocumque voluisset. Et vnde supplicauit predicto Ade quod istud inquireret per liberos et legales homines: set idem Adam istud nolebat, set sic iniuste retinuit predictos equos, et eos equitauit et equitari permisit de predicto die vsque ad vnum mensem proximum sequentem quousque predictus Rogerus finem fecit cum eo per x. libras: ad dampnum ipsius Rogeri xl. librarum etc.

Et Adam venit et dicit quod predicta die dominica² predicto

¹ Widford, near Ware, Herts.

² MS., Hominico.

anno nec aliquo tempore post transfretacionem dum Rex fuit vltra mare [cepit etc.], et hoc petit quod inquiratur, et predictus Rogerus similiter. Ideo preceptum est vicecomiti de Hertfordia quod venire faciat hic in quindena Purificacionis beate Marie tot et tales de visneto Wydefordie per quos etc. et qui nec etc. ad certificandum etc. Et similiter preceptum vicecomiti Middelsexie et vicecomiti Londonie quod venire [facerent] hic ad hunc diem tot et tales etc. de visneto de Neugate etc. Ad quem diem veniunt predicti Rogerus et Adam. Et iuratores ex consensu parcium electi dicunt super sacramentum suum quod predictus Adam cepit duos equos predicti Rogeri, videlicet vnum equum morellum et alium bayum, et ipsos abduxit vsque Londoniam, et eos detinuit quousque predictus Rogerus finem fecerat cum eo per decem libras. Et requisiti per auditores si ista transgressio facta fuit post vltimam transfretacionem Regis, dicunt quod sic. Et requisiti ad que dampna, dicunt quod ad dampna quatuor marcarum preter illas decem libras quas finiuit cum predicto Adam. Ideo consideratum est quod predictus Rogerus recuperet versus predictum Adam predictas decem libras et dampna sua que taxantur ad quatuor marcas. Et predictus Adam conuincatur gayole.

Dampna
xix. marce.

21

Defendant.—Thomas de Weyland, chief justice of Common Pleas.

Complainant.—Abbot of St. Évroult.

Reference to manuscript.—B., Membranes 23, 33d.

No other references.

Number of case in Appendix III., 165.

Willelmus Wareyn generalis attornatus abbatis de sancto Ebrulpho¹ habens potestatem faciendi attornatos abbatis per breue domini Regis [ponit loco dicti] abbatis Iohannem Asser versus Thomam Weylaunde et alios iusticiarios de banco et abbatem Leycestrie de placito falsi iudicii.

Lanc.
m. 2

Abbas de sancto Ebrulpho queritur quod cum idem abbas tulisset quoddam breue coram iusticiariis de banco versus

Leyc.
m. 33d.

¹ Saint-Evroult, Benedictine abbey, dep. Orne.

abbatem de Leycestria et petisset per idem breue quater viginti et xij. libras que ei arretro fuerunt de quodam annuo redditu xxj. marcarum ante illud breue inpetratum, et triginta et octo libras que ei arretro fuerunt de eodem redditu post breuia inpetrata, et pendente inde placito coram eisdem iusticiariis computauerunt predicti abbates, ita quod predictus abbas de Leycestria tenebatur abbati de sancto Ebrulpho predicto in vi^{xx}. et xj. libris, de quibus predicti iusticiarii considerauerunt quod predictus abbas de sancto Ebrulpho recuperaret tantum sexaginta, et quod de residuis lxxj. libris nichil recuperaret, et de dampnis suis que habuit occasione detencionis predicti redditus ad valenciam xlv. librarum, unde petit remedium desicut predictus abbas de Leycestria neque acquietanciam neque aliquid aliud habuit quod ei valere potuit quin predicta arreragia et redditum soluere debuit.

crastinum.

APPENDIX I

THE PASSION OF THE JUDGES

THE *Narratio de Passione Justiciariorum* here appended is an interesting example of mediæval satire. Some quick-witted clerk, struck by the crisis of 1289, has narrated the events of the year in mock parable. Using his extensive knowledge of Scripture phrase and story, he has woven an elaborate narrative, where culprits and king alike appear in Scriptural guise. The solemn mockery of the result produced is as ingenious as it is profane; as well worth reading as impossible of translation. The introduction of characters, the play upon names, the twisting of well-known phrases to suit the purpose of the tale, are managed with skill, and produce a clever, if extraordinary, medley. Incidentally the parody shows how little basis there is to the popular view that the middle ages had but a slight acquaintance with the Bible.

The 'Passion' is to be found in two manuscripts. The first is in the British Museum, Add. MSS. 31826, f. 54; the second in All Souls College, Oxford, MS. 39, f. 109b.¹ In each case the volume where the 'Passion' occurs is made up of miscellaneous documents not connected with it save in being of roughly the same date. The main part of the British Museum volume is a yearbook of law cases, 28-34 Edw. I. It is notable that also among its contents are the treatises *Hengham Magna* and *Hengham Parva*, almost the only abiding work of one of the greater culprits of 1289. There is a certain irony in this juxtaposition of enduring work and enduring disgrace. The All Souls volume contains more general

¹ The latter is perhaps a copy of the former, for certain sentences are omitted with detriment to the sense: or, more probably, both are derived from the same source, which we have not found.

matter—lists of kings, &c. It is possible that our unknown clerk is not to be unduly praised for his originality. The form of satire in which he couched his story was neither unknown nor distasteful to the ages of faith, and seems to have been especially popular in England, where, for example, a thirteenth-century parody of St. Luke's Gospel tells the story of a drunken king named Wernardus and his companions, while a fourteenth-century *Missa de Potatoribus* in similar fashion parodies the service of the Mass.¹ Another almost contemporary example of a similar 'Passion' with an historical basis is preserved for us in the *Passio Scotorum Perjuratorum*, 'a would-be comic narrative of events between February 1306 and February 1307,' which has been published with notes by the late Marquess of Bute.² A third contemporary instance can be read in the *Chronicle* of Adam of Usk,³ where the story of the battle of Courtrai (1302) is told after the same profane fashion. Adam of Usk himself was so much impressed by this literary venture, which he discovered a hundred years after the battle among the chronicles of the monastery of Eekhout, near Bruges, that, regardless of its irrelevance, he thought it worthy of transcription into his work. We may almost infer from this that by the early fifteenth century such satires had so far ceased to be commonly employed that they were regarded as literary curiosities.

In preparing the text the British Museum MS. has been followed as the most generally trustworthy. Variants in the All Souls MS. are noted at the foot of the page, except where they are merely the arrangement of the same words in different order. In the footnotes the manuscripts are distinguished as A and B, the former representing the British Museum copy, the latter the All Souls manuscript.

¹ Wright and Halliwell, *Reliquiæ Antiquæ* (1843), ii. 58, 208. Cf. for other references Gröber, *Grundriss der romanischen Philologie* (1893), ii. 1, 323.

² *Notice of a Manuscript of the latter part of the fourteenth century entitled Passio Scotorum Perjuratorum*, by the Marquess of Bute, in *Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland*, vol. xix. pp. 166 et sq. (1885). Our attention has been called to this by the kindness of Mr. Henry Gough, who discovered the *Passio Scotorum* in a MS. now deposited in the Public Library at Reigate Church. It is of contemporary date, and has, curiously enough, been closely copied in two versions at least of *Flores Historiarum* (cf. *Flores*, iii. 128–136 and 322–325, Rolls Ser.).

³ *Adam of Usk's Chronicle*, ed. Sir E. Maunde Thompson (1904), pp. 106, 107.

NARRATIO DE PASSIONE JUSTICIARIORUM¹

[The Marginalia refer to the Vulgate, and are inserted to indicate how large a proportion of the text consists of Scriptural passages, taken over wholesale or parodied. Where all the synoptic Gospels contain a passage, reference is given merely to that one where the phrasing most closely approximates to the language of the writer.]

In illo tempore² rex³ quidam nobilis abiit in regionem longinquam accipere sibi tributum⁴, et⁴ vocavit servos suos et tradidit illis bona sua⁵ et potestatem dedit eis iudicium facere⁶ et iustitiam. Unusquisque secundum propriam virtutem paravit in iudicio⁷ tronum suum⁸: et oblitus est clamorem pauperum⁹ et opprobrium accepit adversus proximum¹⁰ suum¹¹. Sederunt¹² cum divitibus in occultis ut interficerent¹³ innocentes¹⁴ et dextra eorum repleta est muneribus¹⁵. Dixeruntque inter se, 'Nolumus hunc¹⁶ regnare super nos'¹⁷: quia in proverbii scriptum est,¹⁸ 'Rex insipiens perdet populum suum, et civitates inhabitabuntur per sensum prudentum.'¹⁹ Et quia nichil occultum quod non reveletur,²⁰ Rex,²¹ cum audisset hos sermones, ascendit in naviculam, transfretavit, et venit in terram suam.²² Filii autem Israel ambulaverunt per siccum juxta mare.²³

Quidam autem adoraverunt cum muneribus: quidam vero dubitaverunt.²⁴ Unus autem ex eis, quidam²⁵ Didimus²⁶ non erat cum eis quando venit dominus,²⁷ set mare vidit et fugit,²⁸ et finxit se longius ire,²⁹ et reliquit domum suam et uxorem, filios, fratres, agros, oves et boves et universa pecora campi,³⁰ et fugit in fontem Babilonis, et erat ibi in vestimentis ovium³¹ propter metum iudiciorum³²: et omnis sapientia eius devorata est,³³ et factus est timor super omnes vicinos eius et

¹ MS. B Passio ministrorum domini Edwardi regis Anglie secundum opera sua.

² MS. A turbine.

³ MS. B Edwardus rex.

⁴ MS. A reverti

⁵ MS. B sibi.

⁶ MS. B proximos.

⁷ MS. B sedent.

⁸ MS. B interficiant.

⁹ MS. B regem.

¹⁰ MS. B quod.

¹¹ MS. B autem.

¹² MS. A dubitabant.

¹³ MS. A qui dicitur.

¹⁴ Thomas de Weyland, who fled on the King's arrival to Babwell (fons Babilonis), a house of the friars minor, near Bury St. Edmunds. There he assumed the friar's habit (vestimenta ovium), confessing that he had been a subdeacon in the past, before his marriage. Guards under Robert Malet surrounded the buildings, preventing the friars from procuring food for their visitor, and allowing them to leave, but not to re-enter the house. Compare Peckham's letter in favour of the fugitive, *Registrum Epistolarum Johannis Peckham*, iii. 968, Rolls Series.

^v Luke i. 65.

^w Matt. xxvii. 65.

^x John xi. 48.

^y Matt. xxvii. 64.

^z Matt. xxvii. 66.

^a Joshua xviii. 8.

^b Ps. xi. 6.

^c Deut. xxxii. 41.

^d Matt. viii. 11.

^e Ps. xvi. 12.

^f Ps. cxliiii. 13.

^g John i. 24.

^h 1 John v. 19.

1 Mac. vi. 22.

super omnia montana Anglie divulgabantur¹ verba hec.^v Tunc dixit Rex² suis 'Habete custodiam illius: ite, custodite sicut scitis,^w ne forte veniant Romani et tollant nostrum locum et gentem^x: et erit novissimus error peior priore.'^y Illi autem abierunt signantes Babiloniam cum custodibus.^z

Rex vero ulterius proficiscens dixit domesticis suis: 'Circuite terram et perambulate eam,^a et audite voces populi mei qui est in Egipto, quia propter miseriam inopum et gemitum pauperum nunc^b exurgam^b et reddam ultionem hostibus meis^c et hiis qui oderunt me retribuam.'^c Illi autem ab oriente et occidente^d et a desertis^e montibus diligenter inquirentes invenerunt aliquos qui fuerunt^f tanquam paratos ad predicta^g et sicut catuli^g leonum habitantes in abditis^h et promptuaria eorum plena eructancia ex hoc in illud.^f Et qui missi fueruntⁱ erant ex Phariseis.^g Et dixerunt ad regem, 'Ecce, totus mundus in maligno positus est^h: quare non facis iudicium et vindicas fratres nostros?'ⁱ Tunc ait^j Rex, 'Nox habe(bi)t consilium.'

Et post pauca appropinquavit Rex^j Londinie, vidit civitatem et flevit super illam^k et dixit, 'Quia si cognovisses et tu.'^j Et statim egressus est populus de tabernaculis suis et tulerunt archam federis domini^l contra eum^k et dixerunt, 'Iste est Rex noster qui a servitute Egiptiaca liberavit^l nos.'^j Rex vero transiens per medium illorum ibat^m et intravit paradysum suum ut quereret hominem quem creaverat,^l et dixit, 'Adam, Adam, ubi es?'ⁿ Olim quidem debui perdere te, set pecunia tua oravit pro te.^l Redde rationem villicationis tue.'^o Respondit Adam, 'Fodere non valeo, mendicare erubescio.'^p Et cum accusaretur in multis non respondit verbum.^q Novissime autem^o venerunt duo ingrati testes et dixerunt, 'Hic dixit, "Possum destruere domum vestram in

¹ MS. A inserts 'omnia.'

² MS. A inserts 'ministris.'

³ MS. B omits 'nunc.'

⁴ MS. B omits 'meis.'

⁵ MS. A desertibus.

⁶ MS. B omits 'qui fuerunt.'

⁷ MS. B leones paratos ad predictam.

⁸ MS. A oculi.

⁹ MS. B inserts 'suis.'

¹⁰ MS. B fuerant.

¹¹ MSS. erat.

¹² MS. B. dixit.

¹³ Omitted in MS. B.

¹⁴ MS. B eam.

¹⁵ Omitted in MS. B.

¹⁶ MS. B liberabit.

¹⁷ Adam de Stratton.

¹⁸ A reference to his previous conviction in 1279 for forgery and fraud, at the suit of the abbot and monastery of Quarr. Stratton's disgrace on this occasion was only brief, for within the year all offices were restored to him. See *Red Book of the Exchequer*, Introduction iii. cexx.-xxii.

¹⁹ Omitted in MS. B.

^r Matt. xxvi. 60-61. triduo, et nunquam reedificare illam.'''¹ Dixit et facta sunt, mandavit et destructa sunt.'^s Tunc dixit illi preses, 'Non audis quanta adversum te dicunt testimonia?' Et non respondit verbum,^t set exivit foras et flevit amare.^u Tunc apprehenderunt eum ministri et posuerunt eum in carcerem. Et dixit Rex ministris suis, 'Ite, colligite fragmenta ne pereant.' Collegerunt ergo² et impleverunt plusquam xii. cophinos^v denariorum in loco³ tabernaculi domus sue, et multa alia que non sunt scripta in libro hoc.^w Igitur qui convenerant interrogabant dominum dicentes, 'Domine, si in tempore⁴ restitues^x illi⁵ quicquam.' Dixit autem Rex,⁶ 'Non est vestrum nosse thesaurum vel monetam que posuit in potestate mea.'^y ⁷

Et post pauca exiit edictum a Rege prefato⁸ ut discriberentur universe seditiones terre.^z ⁹ Et ibant omnes ut profiterentur in Londiniam civitatem.^a Et scisma erat inter eos.^b Testimonium ergo perhibebat turba que erat^c ibidem quod aliqui ministri Regis transgrediebantur traditiones seniorum,^d amabant primos¹⁰ recubitus in cenis et primas cathedras in sinagogis, et salutationes in foro, et vocari ab hominibus Rabi.^e Et per eos occultatum est aurum et argentum terre. Et dispersi sunt lapides sanctuarii in capite omnium platearum.^f Et cum audisset Rex hos sermones infremuit spiritu^g et dixit, 'Mihi vindicta¹¹ et ergo retribuam.'^h

Item fecit Londonie cenam magnam et vocavit multos. Et misit servos suos hora cene dicere invitatis ut venirent. Et ceperunt aliqui se¹² excusare.¹³ Primus dixit, 'Villas emi pecunia non numerata,¹⁴ et necesse habeo videre illas.'¹⁵ Et¹⁶ alter dixit, 'Juga bovum emi quinquaginta et eo probare illa.'¹⁷ Et alius¹⁸ dixit, 'Uxorem duxi alienam et vado probare illam.'¹⁹ Reversique servi nunciaverunt²⁰ hec domino Regi. Tunc ait Rex, 'Ite, compellite eos²¹ intrare^j huc²² coram me. Crastina die delebitur iniquitas terre.'^k Et

¹ MS. B eam.² Omitted in MS. B.³ MS. A locum.⁴ MS. B inserts 'hoc.'⁵ MS. B ei.⁶ MS. B omits 'rex,' inserts 'eis.'⁷ MS. B vestra.⁸ MS. B predicto.⁹ This is the response to the invitation given to complainants by the writ to the sheriffs of October 13, 1289 (*Fœdera*, i. pt. 2, p. 715).¹⁰ MS. B omits 'primos.'¹¹ MS. A vindictam.¹² MS. B omits 'se.'¹³ MS. B inserts 'postmodum.'¹⁴ MS. A numeravi.¹⁵ MS. B eas.¹⁶ MS. B omits 'et.'¹⁷ MS. B ea.¹⁸ MS. B tertius.¹⁹ MS. B eam.²⁰ MS. B nuntiabant, omits 'hec.'²¹ MS. B venire et.²² MS. B omits 'huc.'

¹ John xii. 19.^m Matt. ii. 11.ⁿ John v. 25.^e Prov. xiv. 13.^p Deut. xxxii. 35.^q Ps. xlv. 8.^r Matt. xxi. 2.^s Luke xxii. 40.^t John vi. 69^v Ps. lxxxviii. 35.^w Ps. xciv. 11, and
Hebrews iii. 11.^x John xiii. 8.^y Ps. xcvi. 4.^z Matt. vi. 10.^a Matt. ii. 12.^b Rom ii. 6.

considerabo novissima eorum.' Dixerunt aliqui, 'Videmus quod nichil proficimus. Ecce totus mundus¹ super nos et super opera nostra. Eamus et offeramus ei munera, aurum quia rex est, thus quia prelatus,¹ murrum^m quia immortalis,² et forte³ miserebitur nobis.⁴ Et cum venissent ad Regem, dixit ille,⁵ 'Amen, dico vobis,⁶ quia venit hora et nunc estⁿ quod risus vester dolore miscebitur,^o populus autem gaudebit. Mea est ultio et ego retribuam vobis in tempore,^p quia dilexistis iniquitatem et odistis iusticiam.^q Ite in castellum quod contra vos est. Et invenietis^r alios alligatos et plures cum eis.^r Illic orate^s ne intretis in temptationem.'^s Dixeruntque illi, 'Domine, verba vite habes; cum quo ibimus?'^t Tunc ait Rex, 'Cum custode civitatis, ut respondeat pro vobis in die iudicii.'¹⁰ 'Domine Rex, miserere nobis.' Tunc ait Rex, 'Que procedunt de labiis meis non faciam irrita.'^v semel iuravi in ira mea,^w non habebitis partem mecum,^x quia honor regis iudicium diligit.'^y Illi autem dixerunt, 'Domine, fiat voluntas tua.'^z Et¹¹ secuti sunt custodem, et per aliam viam reversi sunt^a in Babiloniam, expectantes donec veniat dominus ultionum, dominus qui reddet unicuique iuxta¹² opera sua.

In MS. B the appended verses immediately follow the 'Passion':

Sumpserunt curbyt Wey^{land} Brun^{ton} Lu. Ley^{cestr} perit Lyt^{biry}¹³
Et plures facient tanto magis sitient.
Set nequeunt bibere claro cratere soluto
Cernere nec serere dedecus esse puto.
Lyt^{biry} plangunt plures, reliquos dicunt fore fures.
Est Adam de Strat^e in scaccario per escheke mat.
Sumitur ille rocus¹⁴ nec minor ille locus,
Set caueant gentes in banco nunc¹⁵ residentes
Ne dent iudicium quod teneat nitium,

¹ MS. B inserts 'est.'² MS. B inserts 'est.'³ MS. B inserts 'si.'⁴ MS. A nostri.⁵ MS. B inserts 'rex.'⁶ MS. B. omits from this point to 'tempore.'⁷ MS. B inserts 'ibi.'⁸ MS. B illis.⁹ MS. A intrate.¹⁰ MS. B inserts 'Dixerunt ministri.'¹¹ MS. B. inserts 'tunc.'¹² MS. B secundum.¹³ Weyland, Brompton, Lovetot, Leicester, Littlebury and Stratton are left in their abbreviated forms for convenience of scansion.¹⁴ 'The castle (in chess, still also called the rook) is taken away and the board is none the worse.' For this and certain emendations we are indebted to Mr. A. G. Little.¹⁵ MS. ne.

Si sui attincti punientur fune reuincti.¹
Hoc Rex iuravit, facta sequendo David;
Sex sunt proscripti: non est exul nisi solus,
Set sunt convicti: fecit inesse dolus.
Expectant ceteri vindictas quas meruerunt;
Tristes sunt miseri reges qui primo fuerunt.
Non est inmerito falsorum tempore scito,
Vincas Rexque cito: tales dominare nolito.
Est vbi solamen quod sunt super acta gravati
Et ² cito dampnati totus populus ferat Amen.

¹ MS. funere vincti.

² MS. est.

APPENDIX II.

Note.—The following abbreviations are used : H. = hundred. S. = sheriff.

—	Name of Accused	Office	Accuser
1	Abbot, John. . . Heyth, Alex. de la	Bs. of H. of Humbleyard .	Agnes de Dunstone .
2	Aledone, Hen. de .	S.B. of H. of Larkfield .	J. Ruffyn de Leyburne.
3	Alevent, Will. de ¹ .	B. of H. of Lothingland .	Geoff. de Thurton .
4	Ditto and Slipet, Rog. Burdone, Rich.	ditto	Will. Makesyre .
5	Aleyn, Pet. . . . Noreys, Rob. de Gargat, Will. Bernham, Jo. de Dole, Steph.	Bs. of S. of Sussex . .	Jo. de Polynsand .
6	Aleyn, Pet. . . . Fraunceys, Rob.	B. of S. of Sussex . . . S.B.	Jo. Dammartin .
7	Annesleye, Jo. de † ²	S. of Notts and Derbys. [1285] ³	Sim. de Notyngham .

¹ Also spelt Alewent.

² Also spelt Anesle.

³ The date between square brackets is the date at which a sheriff was appointed, or at which his account was commenced. The dates are taken from the *List of Sheriffs, P.R.O. Lists and Indexes*, No. IX.

ANALYSIS OF ROLL 541 A.

B. = bailiff S.S. = under-sheriff. S.B. = sub-bailiff. in M. = in misericordia.

Offence	Result	Reference-membrane	County
—	—	53* . . .	Norfolk
Seizure of horses .	Hen. <i>sine die</i> . . . Jo. in M.	3d* . . .	Kent
—	—	22d*, 37d, 44d .	Suffolk
Seizure of beasts .	—	23*, 37d, 44d .	Suffolk
Seizure of grain, beasts, and money.	—	25d, 26*, 55d, 58d . . .	Sussex
Seizure of grain .	—	18, 27*, 40 .	Sussex
—	—	30 . . .	Notts.

—	Name of Accused	Office	Accuser
8	Annesleye, Jo. de	S. of Notts and Derbys. [1285]	Rog. de Beltoft .
9	Ditto . . .	ditto . . .	Will. de Cateclive .
10	Ditto . . .	ditto . . .	Jo. de Heryz . .
11	Ditto and Roldestone, Nich. de	ditto . . . B. of Newark	Will. de Roynburgh de Cotoun
12	Ditto . . .	S. of Notts. and Derby .	Sim. de Paris . .
13	Ditto . . .	ditto . . .	Avice, who was the wife of Tho. Martin de Tydeswell
14	Ditto and Bulcote, Geoff. .	ditto . . . B.	Jo. de Bremyngtone .
15	Ansthorp, Tho. de . Lithsote, Will. . Staynborn, Tho. de	B. of the Wapentake of North Claro. S.Bs.	Will. Brun de Derlyng- tone, chaplain
16	Appelby, Pet. de . Sperry, Reyner . Wyte, Nich. le . Segenaus, Jo. .	Bs. of York . . . Clerk to bailiffs	Alice de Thoreworthe . —
17	Appelby, Pet. de . Popeltone, Will. de	Bs. of York . . .	Hugh le Biller and Rog. le Blund
18	Appelby, Rog. de ¹	S. of Middlesex . .	Saer de Peldone .

¹ Probably an under-sheriff. His name does not appear in the *List of Sheriffs*.

Offence	Result	Reference-membrane	County
False returns . . .	Rog. did not come, so <i>Jo. sine die</i>	50d*, 55d* .	Notts.
—	Will. did not come, so <i>Jo. sine die</i>	54d* . . .	—
Failure to inform Jo. of day and place, so that he lost case	Jo. de Heryz to re- cover his losses	69d*, 75d. .	Notts.
—	—	28d . . .	Notts.
—	—	3d, 28d, 37d .	Derbys.
Delay in executing writ	Avicé did not come, so <i>Jo. sine die</i>	3d*, 36d, 60, 66, 74*	Derbys.
—	—	30 . . .	Notts.
—	—	30d, 54d, 56 .	Yorks.
—	—	41 . . .	Yorks.
—	—	28 . . .	Yorks.
Relaxing distraint, so that Saer could not recover debts	Saer did not come, so <i>Rog. sine die</i>	29, 39*	Yorks.

—	Name of Accused	Office	Accuser
19	Appelby, Rog. de .	S. of Middlesex . . .	Steph. de Depham . .
20	Asshe, Rob. de .	—	Alice de Caveforde . .
21	Attehurst, Tho. .	Keeper of Worcester Gaol .	Mariota de Immer . .
22	Attehurste, Rich. . Malegrafe, Will. Forester	Jo. Foucher
23	Avenewyk, Hen. de †Wyforne, Hen. Careter, Roger le Isabel, Jo. Knyght, Will. le †Hereneghe, Will.	Ministers of the King . .	Hereward de la More de Bluntesdone
24	†Aynesham, Hen. de	B. of [H. of] Bullingdon .	Tho. de Somerton, Alice his wife
25	Bachelaye, Will. de	King's B.	Will. Paulynde Rette- ford
26	Ditto	ditto	Rob., son of Pet. de Brayton
27	Bacoun, Rog. .	B. of H. of Witham . .	Nich. de la Brome . .
28	Bacoun, Rog. . Bartholomew Leschild, Rich. " Tho. Cauleton, Rob. de Slemondeshey, Jo. Ultinges, Tho. de	B. of King, honour of Boulogne Clerks of Rog. . . .	Rob. Huberd de Whitenotle
29	Bagstone, Tho. de	—	Rich. Prat
30	Balheued, Rob. .	S.B. of B. of [H. of] Claydon	Albreda Parmyhod . .

Offence	Result	Reference-membrane	County
False returns -	—	32d* . . .	Middlesex
—	—	8 . . .	Essex
Violence . .	—	16d* . . .	Worcesters.
Unjust fine . .	Rich. <i>sine die</i> , Jo. in M.	1*, 37d . . .	Essex
Seizure of goods, ejection	All made fines. Here-ward to recover losses	48*, 56d, 66, 74d, 76	Wilts.
—	—	74, 77 . . .	Oxon.
—	—	74d . . .	Notts
—	—	74d . . .	Notts
—	—	41d . . .	Essex
Procuring indictment of Rob. for theft. Seizure of beasts.	Bacoun <i>sine die</i> , Rob. in M. Leschild to gaol. Charge withdrawn against Barth. and Tho. de Ultinges	36d, 44d, 48*, 57, 60d, 71, 73	Essex
—	—	8d . . .	Devon
Seizure of horse .	Albreda withdrew. Balheued <i>sine die</i>	16d* . . .	Suffolk

—	Name of Accused	Office	Accuser
31	Balheued, Rob. .	S.B. of B. of [H. of] Claydon	Jo. Joce de Debenham
32	Bannebiri, Rog. de	B. of Bishop of Lincoln .	—
33	†Banbiry, Rog. de .	Hundredman . . .	Agnes la Canoune de Todmertone
34	Ditto and Lyonn, Jo. le	ditto . . .	ditto . . .
35	Ditto . . .	ditto . . .	Rob. Justices de Banbury
36	Ditto . . .	ditto . . .	Tho. de Mareys .
37	Ditto . . .	ditto . . .	Margery, wife of Will. Attele de Banbiry
38	Barowe, Rog. de .	Clerk of Tho. de Farne- don, late S. of Leicester	Rich. de la Hulle de Outheby
39	Barri, Will. . .	B. of H. of Worth . .	Jo. Malemeyns . .
40	Bartelum, Hen. Warde, Nich. .	S.S. of Yorks. . . His clerk	Geoff. de Kellawe .
41	Baud, Rob. le .	S. of Northants. . .	Nich. son of Will. de Turville
42	Ditto . . .	ditto . . .	Will. de Tyryngham clerk

Offence	Result	Reference-membrane	County
Illtreatment . . .	—	24d*, 57 . . .	Suffolk
	—	36d . . .	[Lincs.]
Seizure, imprison- ment	Agnes to recover losses. Rog. to gaol	23*, 37 . . .	Oxon.
ditto . . .	As to imprisonment, Rog. <i>sine die</i> . Lyonn to gaol	77* . . .	Oxon.
Imprisonment . .	—	22*, 75d . . .	Oxon.
Seizure of goods, illtreatment, im- prisonment	Goods were forfeit: Rog. <i>sine die</i> . Im- prisonment was for theft: Rog. <i>sine die</i>	35* . . .	Oxon.
Non-execution of writ	Not at a date of which the auditors had cog- nissance	35* . . .	Oxon.
Imprisonment, sei- zure of beasts	Rog. in M. Rich. to recover beasts	42*, 53, 60, 67d	Leicesters. Warwicks.
Seizure of goods .	—	7d* . . .	Kent
Assault, imprison- ment	—	6* . . .	Yorks.
Seizure of beasts .	Nich. recovered losses. Rob. in custody	24d*, 53d, 66, 68d	Northants.
Imprisonment . .	—	42d* . . .	Northants.

—	Name of Accused	Office	Accuser
43	Bayle, Jordan de . Whittingham, Ad. de Irlam, Rob. de Asbo, Hugh de Thorntone, Almaric de	Bs. of Blackburnshire, Lancs. B. of Amounderness B. of Leylandshire B. of Blackburnshire	John Denias . . .
44	Bedel, Ralph le .	—	Sim. le Estrange ¹ de Gillingham
45	Bel, Hen. le . . . Rob., son of Sim. de Netherkote Willares, Nich. de Waryn, Rich.	Coroner Bs.	Walt., son of Walt. de Doington
46	†Belencombe, Jo. de	B. of Suffolk . . .	Will. de Brokedis .
47	Belhous, Tho. de ²	S. of Cambs. and Hunts. [1281]	Tho. de Exeter . .
48	Ditto . . .	ditto . . .	Rog. le Granger .
49	Ditto and Kyntht, Steph. .	ditto . . . B.	Nich., son of Rob. de Hengham
50	Bellows, Rich. de	—	—
51	Bereford, Osbert de	Late S. [of Leicestershire] [1273, 1280]	Tho. Hote de Folyholl
52	Berkham, Austin de	Verderer of King's forest .	Walt. de Belstede .

¹ Also spelt Straunge.² Also spelt Belhus.

Offence	Result	Reference-membrane	County
—	—	5d, 25, 44	Lancs.
Seizure of a boat, with cargo	Sim. did not come, so in M., and Ralph <i>sine</i> <i>die</i> . But Ralph made fine to King	47*, 53, 60, 66d	Kent
—	Walt. did not come. Accused <i>sine die</i>	18d* . .	Gloucesters.
Seizure of horse .	Jo. amerced. 1292, made fine	28, 45, 49*, 64, 68	Essex
Seizure of horse .	Charge withdrawn . Tho. in M.	12* . . .	Cambs.
Release of horses attached for debt	Belhous <i>sine die</i> , Rog. in M.	12* . . .	Hunts.
False returns, im- prisonment	Nich. did not come, Tho. <i>sine die</i>	21*, 37d . .	Hunts.
S. returned writs late, so in M.	—	36* . . .	Norfolk
—	—	25d . . .	[Leicesters.]
Procuring indict- ment, imprison- ment	Accused <i>sine die</i> , Walt. in M.	52d*, 53 . .	Hants.

	Name of Accused	Office	Accuser
53	Bertone, Jo. de Clerk, Jo. le	Bs. of Norwich . . .	Rob. Alyn . . .
54	Bertone, Jo. de . Virk, Geoff. ² Martin, Nich. Cacherel, Regin.	ditto	Jo. Curpayl ¹ . . .
55	†Bissopegate, Ad. de †Serjaunt, Ralph le Dorre, Andrew	Bs.	Margaret, daughter of Tho. Wyberd
56	Blaunch, Rob. le .	Parson of church of Bir- lingham, clerk of H. of Persnore	Rob., son of Olive de Stafford
57	Ditto	ditto	Jo. Assewy of London
58	Ditto	Ditto, clerk of Rob. le Deken	Rich. de Birlingham, clerk
59	Blamminster, Jo. de	B. of [H.] of Dunmow .	Will., son of Walt. de Dunmawe
60	Ditto	ditto	Walt. Paykynde magna Dunmawe
61	Ditto	ditto	Jo. Foucher
62	Blount, Will. le, de Doverdale Grafton, Jo.	Coroner of Worcester, Keeper of the Peace	Rich. de Santmareys, parson of church of Grafton
63	Blount, Hugh le .	Once S. of Essex [1286] .	Jo. Foucher

¹ Also spelt Cappel.² Also spelt Virly.

Offence	Result	Reference-membrane	County
—	—	20d . . .	Norfolk
—	—	30d, 41d, 54d, 67d, 74	Norfolk
—	Margaret did not come. Accused <i>sine die</i>	25* . . .	Kent
Procuring indictment	To be jury <i>nisi prius</i> .	31* . . .	Worcesters.
Imprisonment .	—	24d* . . .	Worcesters.
Imprisonment through mistake of name	—	27d* . . .	Worcesters.
—	—	54d . . .	Essex
—	Walter recovered 26s. 8d.	25 . . .	Essex
Non-execution of writs	Accused <i>sine die</i> , Jo. Foucher in M.	1* . . .	Essex
Illtreatment . .	Jo. showed he was not a B. at time. So Rich. in M. Will. appealed to 'patria'	13* . . .	Worcesters.
False returns. Unjust taking of inquest	To go before Hugh of Cressingham, senechal of Queen	39* . . .	Essex

—	Name of Accused	Office	Accuser
64	Bolde, Hugh de la Bladinton, Will. de	—	Walt. de Doington .
65	Borghulle, ¹ Rog. de Stretton, Will. de .	S. of Hereford [1278] Clerk	Hen. le Mareschal .
66	Ditto . . .	ditto . . .	Rog. de Longhoure, senior
67	Ditto . . .	ditto . . .	Rich. de Bagingedene
68	Ditto, and Stretton, Will. de	ditto . . . Clerk	Jo. Devereus . . .
69	Ditto, and Porter, Jo., etc.	ditto . . .	Will. de Evereus de Leuhales
70	Ditto, and others	ditto . . . Bs. . . .	Jo. Ornay of Islynton
71	†Botard, Jo. . .	King's B., [H.] of Basset- law	Ad. de Deneby . . .
72	Boxford, Will. de . Badlingham, Will. de Berningham, Steph. de	Bs. of [H. of] Blackburn	Louisa de Kotfeld .
73	Boxstede, ² Ralph de Melho, Rog. de . Peyntour, Rob. le Bures, Silvester de Aldham, Walt. de	S. of Essex [1288] Clerks	Rob. de Keneburne .

¹ Also spelt Burhulle, Burhull, Burghulle.² Also spelt Buxstede, Woxstede.

Offence	Result	Reference-membrane	County
—	Walt. did not come. Hugh and Will. <i>sine die</i>	18d* . . .	Gloucesters.
Bribery, imprisonment, seizure of goods	—	34d*, 37, 53, 54d, 60d, 64d, 67	Herefords.
Seizure of oxen, selling of corn	—	17d* . . .	Herefords.
Seizure of beasts .	—	24* . . .	Herefords.
Favour . . .	—	6d*, 8d . . .	Herefords.
Violence, seizure of goods	—	7d*, 20d, 41d, 43*	Herefords.
Seizure of goods .	—	2* . . .	Herefords.
Illtreatment . .	—	41, 54d, 62d*, 69, 73, 77	Notts.
—	—	41 . . .	Suffolk
Seizure, imprisonment	Silvester, Walt. and Rog., <i>sine die</i>	30, 38d*, 41d .	Essex

—	Name of Accused	Office	Accuser
74	Boxstede, Ralph de Rob. Burre, Will.	ditto Late clerk to Rog. de Melho	Will., son of Will. de Brendehalle
75	Ditto	ditto	Will. Phileman ¹ .
76	Ditto	ditto	Rog. de Melho . . .
77	Ditto	ditto	Drogo de Harentyn .
78	Ditto	ditto	Jo. le Feuere ² de Danyngbury
79	Ditto	ditto	Alice, wife of Sim. de Colchester
80	†Boyville, Will. de. ³	Once S. of Warwicks. and Leicesters. [1288]	Tho. de Seggefelde .
81	Ditto	Once S. of Beds. and Bucks. [1285]	Hen. Olyver de Sta- pelho
82	Ditto	Once S. of Leicesters. .	Rich. de Seleby . .
83	Ditto, and Porter, Tho. le	Once S. of Beds. and Bucks. B. of Dunstable . . .	Will. de Garleke .
84	Boyville, Will. de .	Once S. of Beds. and Bucks.	Will. Hutkoc . . .
85	Ditto	Once S. of Warwicks. .	Emma, daughter of Geoff. de Rokeby
86	Ditto	Once S. of Beds. and Bucks.	Milo de Hastingsges .

¹ Also spelt Filman.² Also spelt Futher.³ Also spelt Beyville, Boyville.

Offence	Result	Reference-membrane	County
Seizure of beasts .	Ralph <i>sine die</i> , Will. in M.	19*, 54 . .	Essex
Imprisonment .	—	37, 48* . .	Essex
—	Rog. did not come. Ralph <i>sine die</i>	37d* . .	Essex
Seizure of beasts .	—	50d* . .	Essex
False return .	—	3d, 8* . .	Essex
—	—	5 . .	Essex
Favour and false returns	Tho. did not come. Will. <i>sine die</i>	31d*, 35d, 54d*, 64d, 67d.	Warwicks.
False return . .	Hen. did not come. Will. <i>sine die</i>	31* . .	Beds.
Vexation and unjust fines	—	31d* . .	Leicesters.
—	Will. did not come. Porter <i>sine die</i>	40d, 55* . .	Beds., Leic.
Imprisonment .	Will. Hutkoc did not come. Accused <i>sine die</i>	10d* . .	Bucks.
Non - execution of writ	Accusation withdrawn .	11*, 16 . .	Warwicks.
Seizure of corn .	—	1d* . .	Bucks.

—	Name of Accused	Office	Accuser
87	Boyvile, Will. de, and Boyvile, Will. de, his son	Once S. of Beds. and Bucks. SS: parson of church of Crowenho	Rich. de S. Egidio .
88	Ditto	Once S. of Beds. and Bucks.	Sarra, wife of Warin of Dene Tho. his son
89	Ditto, and Boondone, Hen. de	Once S. of Warwicks. . Once his B.	Eustace de Hache .
90	Ditto	Once S. of Beds. and Bucks.	Tho. Rykeman de Bronham, Rob. Sigar
91	Ditto	S.	Rob. de Belegrove .
92	Brademer, Rich. de Kynewaldemerhs Ralph de Rither, Steph. Paeton, Ad. de	—	Rich. Goldynges .
93	Bradenath, Warin de Brouthton, Rich. de	—	Jo. Curpel . . .
94	Bragehatch, Wa- renne de Brothtone, Rich. de	B. of Abbey of Ramsey .	Tho. de Bergh . . .
95	Bray, Jo. de . . .	—	Emma, who was wife of Pet. Megersauz de Suthkelesey
96	Bray, Will. de . .	Coroner of Hereford .	Jo. de Balim . . .

Offence	Result	Reference-membrane	County
Seizure of goods .	Will. <i>sine die</i> , Rich. in M.	4*, 30d, 41 . .	Bucks.
Seizure and imprisonment	Will. <i>sine die</i> , Sarra and Tho. in M.	9* . . .	Beds.
Ejection	—	9*, 18d . .	Warwicks.
—	—	54 . . .	Warwicks. and Leicesters.
—	—	57 . . .	Leicesters.
—	Rich. Goldynges did not come. Accused <i>sine die</i>	25, 30, 40d, 55d*	Notts. Derbys.
—	—	29d, 40 . .	Cambs. Hunts.
—	—	8d . . .	Norfolk
—	Emma did not come. Bray <i>sine die</i>	58d* . .	Lincs.
Selling goods at less than value	Bray <i>sine die</i> , Jo. in M. But Jo. to recover goods against town of Markele	1d* . . .	Herefords.

—	Name of Accused	Office	Accuser
97	† Bremleschote, ¹ Will. de	S. of Hants. [1285] .	Hugh de Bokelond .
98	Ditto . . .	ditto . . .	Walt. de Dernforde .
99	Ditto . . .	ditto . . .	Walt. Henge . . .
100	Ditto . . .	ditto . . .	Walt. Russel . . .
101	Ditto, and Keu, Will. le Weyte, Jo. le	ditto Bs.	Alan de Plogenethe ² .
102	Bremlynges, Rob. de Trepnam, Will. de	—	Tho. de Bodyham .
103	†Bret, Ad. . . Payn, Walt.	B. of H. of Williton S.B.	Jo. Aleyn, Flemilda his wife
104	†Breton, Jo. . .	Once Warden of London.	Will. le Chaundeler . Jo. de Flete Regin. le Chaundeler Will. Daveynes ³
105	Brian, Will. . . Dok, Hugh Carouner, Will.	Bs. of the King in Beds. .	Rich. le Peleter de Godiwyk
106	Brigeford, Rob. de, de Coveham Sauser, Jo. le, de Herdyngtone Merwe, Tho. de	— B. S.S. of Surrey	Joan de Hereford .

¹ Also spelt Brymlesote, Brimblechote, Bremeleschyte, Bremleskheta, Brimlechete.² Also spelt Plukenet.³ Also spelt Devenays.

Offence	Result	Reference-membrane	County
Unjust levy of two marks	Will. <i>sine die</i> , Hugh in M.	6* . . .	Hants.
—	Walt. did not come. Will. <i>sine die</i>	8* . . .	Hants.
—	Losses recovered . .	36d* . . .	Hants.
—	Russel recovers money .	37, 54 . . .	Hants.
Seizure of beasts .	Alan recovers losses .	40d, 55, 61d*, 64, 73, 74d	Hants.
—	—	56 . . .	—
Seizure of Flemilda. Stealing goods	Charge withdrawn. Ad. <i>sine die</i>	65*, 73d, 74d .	Somerset
Imprisonment .	Breton <i>sine die</i> . Accusers in M.	29d, 42d* . .	Norfolk
Imprisonment . Seizure of goods	—	16d* . . .	Beds.
Imprisonment .	Joan in M. Committed to gaol	15, 29d, 45, 54d, 58d, 62*	Surrey

—	Name of Accused	Office	Accuser
107	Brigeham, Rob. de Attegrene, Nich. Ralph, son of Ralph de Coldham	B. of H. of Guilteross S.B.	Jo. de Wygenhale
108	Brokesbonyn, Jo. de Bedewell, Pet. de Ayleward, Rob.	Keepers of the Peace	Jo. de Wymptone, clerk
109	Brokesburne, Will. de	B. of H. of Tendring	Olive de Hobrigge, and Julia de Hobrigge
110	Brun, Hen. le	—	Alan, son of Roaldus
111	Bryt, Will. le	Coroner of Derby	Avice, who was wife of Tho. Martin de Tideswelle
112	Bulkote, Geoff. de	B. of the King in Notts and Derby	Susan, who was wife of Jo. del Pek de Cestrefeud
113	Ditto . . .	ditto . . .	Will. de Catteclive
114	Ditto and Onestone, Pet. de	ditto . . .	Will. de Cesterfeud
115	†Bungay, ¹ Geoff. de	Once B. of Norwich	Rog. de Morle . . .
116	Ditto, and Blekestre, Jo. le Bertone, Jo. de	ditto . . .	Jo. de Ronhale, chaplain
117	Bungeye, Steph. de	Constable of the Peace in H. of Lothingland	Will. Skarlet de Shategrave

¹ Also spelt Bungeye.

Offence	Result	Reference-membrane	County
Seizure of beasts. Holding H. ct. in place not an- nounced	Jo. did not come. Brigeham etc. <i>sine die</i>	10* . . .	Norfolk
Refusal to arrest malefactors	Jo. de Wymptone in M. Jo. de Brokes- bonyn etc. <i>sine die</i>	38d* . . .	Herts.
—	Olive and Julia recover money	66 . . .	Essex
—	—	4 . . .	
—	—	53d, 60, 66d .	Derbys.
Housebreaking, ill- treatment	—	62d*, 67d . .	Notts. Derbys.
Imprisonment .	—	62d*, 67d, 68, 73d, 76d	Derbys.
—	—	20, 36d, 55d .	Derbys.
—	—	68 . . .	Norfolk
Removal and substi- tution of jurors	—	4d*, 18, 25, 36 .	Norfolk
—	In end, Will. did not come. Steph. <i>sine die</i>	28d, 36d, 44d .	Norfolk

—	Name of Accused	Office	Accuser
118	Bunt, Jo. . . .	—	Walt. de Dernesforde .
119	†Burgwaresley, ¹ Nich. de	Constable of Bridgnorth .	Rob., son of Gilbert Le Spicer de Bris- tolle
120	Ditto, and Rochale, Regin. de Body, Rich.	—	Will. de Hamme, parson of Hampton Lovett
121	Burley, Jo. de .	B. of H. of Chippenham .	Jo. le Gras de Littel- tone
122	Ditto	ditto	Will. Gefray de Littel- tone
123	Buthe, Alan, de Kyrkeby	Once B. [soke of] Boling- broke [parts of Lind- sey]	Hugh Godale de Revesby
124	Buxstede, Nich. de	—	Jo. Alyet
125	Caruncewyk, Jo. de	Once sub-escheator of York	Jo. Grymet and Maria his wife
126	Castellobromwyz, Hen. de	Constable of the Peace .	Jo. Lovel
127	Catchepol, Will. le, of St. Albans Gilbert	—	Jo. the Merchant .
128	†Chadworth, ² Rob. de	S. of Lincs. [1285, 1287] .	Joan de Dakre . . .
129	Ditto	ditto	Jo. Skarlet

¹ Also spelt Burgwardesle.² Also spelt Chaddeworth, Schadeworth, Schadworth

Offence	Result	Reference-membrane	County
—	Walt. did not come. Bunt <i>sine die</i>	8 . . .	Hants.
—	—	60d . . .	Salop
Seizure of goods .	—	58d, 61d*, 67d, 73, 75d	Salop
Unjust levy of money	—	63* . . .	Wilts.
—	—	63* . . .	Wilts.
—	—	67 . . .	Lincs.
—	—	20 . . .	Essex
Seizure of goods and beasts	—	17d* . . .	Yorks.
Waste and destruc- tion	Jo. to recover losses. But on part of the charge, Hen. <i>sine die</i>	40, 49*, 64d, 66d	Warwicks.
Illtreatment of Jo.'s wife etc.	—	2* . . .	Herts.
Seizure of corn and beasts, breaking into granary	In the end, Joan did not come. Rob. <i>sine die</i>	24*, 73d, 75d* .	Lincs.
—	—	1, 18d, 55, 58d .	Lincs.

—	Name of Accused	Office	Accuser
130	†Chadworth, Rob. de	S. of Lines. [1285, 1287].	Will. de Percy . . .
131	Ditto, and Kestevane, Ad. de Burtone, Nich. Ford, Will. de Borham, Will. de Puttock, Hen.	ditto Bs. Suburban Bs. of Stamford S.B.	Giles le Moygne. . .
132	Chamberleyn, Jo. le Kesteven, Walt. de Bevercotes, Wil. de Edlyngton, Jo. de	Clerk to S. of Lincolns. . B. of King. ditto.	Hen. le Pyper . . . Roland le Clerk de Bamborgh
133	Chamberleyn, ¹ Jo. de	—	Rob. Broun . . .
134	Chann, Jo.	—	Rich. Chann . . .
135	Chapelle, Maynard de la Homersam, Jo. Typpydene, Hen. de	Constable of the Peace .	Will. Schyreve de Snave
136	Chesfeud, ² Will. de	S. of Kent [1286] . .	Prior and convent of St. Gregory, Canter- bury
137	Ditto	ditto	Ad. de Bishopsgate .
138	Ditto	ditto	Will. Paysre ³ . .

¹ Also spelt Chaumberleyn.² Also spelt Chelefeud.³ Also spelt Paystorer.

Offence	Result	Reference-membrane	County
Unjust levy of 8l., distrain of a villein	—	30d, 43*, 55 .	Lincs.
—	Giles did not come. Accused <i>sine die</i>	36* . . .	Lincs.
Imprisonment .	—	27d*, 29d . .	Lincs.
—	Rob. did not come. Jo. <i>sine die</i>	30* . . .	Lincs.
Non - appearance when was surety for payment of rent by Rich.	Jo. <i>sine die</i> , for the accused in question is Jo. Chann senior	21* . . .	Beds.
Seizure of beasts, imprisonment, ill- treatment	Charge withdrawn .	26d, 40, 43d*, 44d	Kent
—	—	1 . . .	Kent
—	—	2d, 18d, 56 .	Kent
Allowing debtor to escape	—	8d, 10* . .	Kent

—	Name of Accused	Office	Accuser
139	Chelesfeud, Will. de	S. of Kent [1286]	Tho. de Rokynges
140	Ditto	ditto	Will. de Arar, citizen of London
141	Ditto	ditto	Phil. Ruffin . . .
142	Ditto, and Chernok, Henry de	ditto	Pet. de Saxhull . . William du Lee
143	Chelesfeud, Will. de Bedel, Ralph le	ditto	Sim. le Estraunge de Gillingeham
144	Ditto	ditto	Jo. de Belham . . .
145	Ditto	ditto	Hen. de Grey . . .
146	Chiche, Steph. .	B. of Canterbury . .	Ad. de Bissepisgate .
147	Chiltenham, Walt. de	Rector of church of Amp- ney, minister of the King	Will. Page . . . Walt. Patyn
148	Chiltone, Jo. de . †Sabyndone, Jo. de †Cartewrithe, Will. le Weylete, Sim. dela Holt, Maurice del Peper, Hugh †Blobe, Sim. †Sabindone, Will. de	B. of H. of Petham . .	Edw. de Kenynfeud and Alice his wife
149	Cimeterio, Ralph de	—	C . . . la Venele de Cestrefeld

Offence	Result	Reference membrane	County
Seizure of beasts and grain	Will. <i>sine die</i> . Tho. in M.	4*, 18, 20, 29d .	Kent
Seizure of beasts, grain, horses	—	5d, 35d* .	Kent
Non - execution of writs, threats	Will. <i>sine die</i> . Phil. in M.	28d, 35d* .	Kent
—	—	30, 41d, 54d .	Kent Lincs.
—	Charge not prosecuted .	28d, 40, 43d*, 54, 56d, 58d, 72	Kent
—	—	28 . . .	Kent
—	—	29 . . .	Kent
When Ad. no longer took farm of Canterbury, Chiche had him sued for arrears	Steph. in M. Ad. to recover 20s.	4* . . .	Kent
—	—	18d, 29d .	Gloucesters.
—	—	57, 60d, 66 .	Kent
—		59 . . .	

—	Name of Accused	Office	Accuser
150	Clerk, Tho. le . Patyndenue, Hen. de	B. of H. of Marden . S.B.	Tho. le Clerk de Merdene
151	Clerk, Tho., son of Rich. de Adelyng- tone	—	Will. Gene de Adelyng- tone and Rob. his son
152	Clife, Rob. de .	Constable of Scarborough, escheator	Will. de Deringtone, chaplain
153	†Clifton, Gerv. de . Bonore, Hen. Coltpyntel, Rob.	S. of Yorks. [1285] . Bs.	Idonea, daughter of Rog. of Middles- halteleshay
154	Clifton, Gerv. de .	S. of Yorks. . . .	Jo. de Staveley . . .
155	Ditto, and Brocton, Rich. de	ditto His clerk	Jo. de Carletone . . .
156	Clifton, Gerv. de .	S. of Yorks. . . .	Walt., son of Mildred de Brocton
157	Ditto	ditto	Jo. le Forester de Fenton
158	Ditto, and Ven, Rog. le Brocton, Rich. de Skyrs, Rog. de Solni, Alured de Huby, Hen. Ottle, Hen. de Rass, Will.	ditto Clerk to S.	Ingram Folensaunt and his son

Offence	Result	Reference-membrane	County
—	—	29d . . .	[Kent]
—	—	40, 45 . . .	Lincs.
—	—	28 . . .	Yorks.
—	—	30d . . .	Yorks.
False imprisonment. Seizure of beasts	—	39*, 55, 68, 73d .	Yorks.
Non - execution of writ, false return to three writs. Asked money in return for execution of writ	Jo. recovered losses. Gervase to gaol	39d*, 56d . .	Yorks.
Seizure of beasts, imprisonment, non-execution of writ	—	39d*, 52*, 72 .	Yorks.
—	—	18d . . .	Yorks.
Imprisonment, seizure of goods	—	2d, 36d, 53, 56d, 64, 66d, 76d*	Yorks.

—	Name of Accused	Office	Accuser
159	Clifton, Gerv. de .	S. of Yorks. . . .	Rich., son of Will. de Fentone
160	Ditto	ditto	Rob. Hughtred de Skar-deburgh
161	Ditto Jo. de St. John . Jo. de Sallay Gervase his son Ranulf de Hunting- teud	ditto His clerk	Will., son of Geoff. de Pykehale
162	Clift n, Gerv. de .	S. of Yorks. . . .	Humph. de Veylly and wife
163	Ditto	ditto	Sim. de Lund . . .
164	Ditto	ditto	Amandus de Ruda .
165	Ditto	ditto	Will. de Braytone, clerk
166	Ditto	ditto	Regin. de Massingham de Donecastre
167	Clifton, Gilb. de .	S. of Lanes. . . . [1284]	Ingram de Gyves .
168	Ditto	ditto	Gilb. de Haleshale .

Offence	Result	Reference-membrane	County
—	—	3, 18d . . .	Yorks.
—	Rob. did not come. Gervase <i>sine die</i>	8, 8d, 28, 37d* .	Yorks.
Seizure, imprisonment	—	9d*, 28d, 40 .	Yorks.
Seizure of goods .	—	10d*, 18d . . .	Yorks.
Levy from Sim. de Lund instead of from Sim. de Lindeseye	Sim. de Lund to recover loss. Clifton in M.	10d* . . .	Yorks.
Seizure, imprisonment, expulsion from house	As to imprisonment, already a suit : so Clifton <i>sine die</i> , and Amandus in M.	11*, 39d, 56d, 71, 74d, 76	Yorks.
Seizure, imprisonment, exaction of money	Will. did not come. Gerv. <i>sine die</i>	11d*, 18d . . .	Yorks.
Wrong conduct of inquiry, imprisonment	Regin. withdrew. So in M. and Clifton <i>sine die</i>	12* . . .	Yorks.
Seizure of oxen. Also, on behalf King, accused of concealing money	—	16* . . .	Lancs.
Unauthorised fining	—	16d* . . .	Lancs.

—	Name of Accused	Office	Accuser
169	Clifton, Gilb. de .	S. of Lancs. . . .	Alan le Breton, par- son of church of Prestcote
170	Ditto . . .	ditto	Joan de Dacre . . .
171	Ditto, and Pluket, Hugh	ditto B.	Rich. le Horsknave de Athertone
172	Clifton, Gilb. de .	S. of Lancs. . . .	Jo. Cofyn
173	Ditto	ditto	Jo. de Bartone <i>qui sequitur pro rege</i>
174	Ditto, and Wartone, Rich. de Tatteloke, Ad. Forester, Ralph le	ditto Bs.	Tho. le Buteler . . .
175	Ditto	ditto	Tho. Mody. . . .
176	Ditto	ditto	Will. de la Sale . .
177	†Clyve, Walt. de la . Honyngtone, Jo. de Cras Eylof, Rog. de Will. his son . . Lundres, Jo. de .	Parson of Poulshot . B. of Melkesham .	Sim. de Paulesholt and others
178	Cockefeld, Rich. de	B. of King in Suffolk .	Tho. Smalwode de la Rose
179	Conestable, Sim. le	Justice of King . .	Jo. le Warde de Halsham

Offence	Result	Reference-membrane	County
Extortion of money	—	23d*, 44d, 56d	Lancs.
Levying whole of debt from Joan alone. Seizure of beasts	—	24d*	Lancs.
Seizure of beasts	—	8, 17d*, 20	Lancs.
Seizure of beasts	—	17d*, 20	Lancs.
Not making proclamation that complaints against ministers should be brought	—	17d*	Lancs.
Distrain in spiritual fief	—	6*, 8, 30	Lancs.
Malicious distrain	—	8d, 26*	Lancs.
—	—	6, 14	Lancs.
Seizure of goods, imprisonment	Walt., Jo. and Jo., not ministri, so <i>sine die</i>	11*, 36d, 54d, 59d, 67, 72, 76	Wilts.
Imprisonment, seizure of goods	—	5d, 14*	Suffolk
—	—	37d, 53	Yorks.

—	Name of Accused	Office	Accuser
180	Corbet, Rob. . and others	Once S. of Salop and Staffs. [1288]	Jo. Paynel and wife .
181	Ditto Norwich, Rob. de . Waleshale, Nich. de Wolverhamtone, Hen. de	ditto S. S.	Tho. le Spicer . . .
182	Corneth, Rob. de . Seriaunt, Phil. le	Seneschal of precentor of St. Paul's	Saer de Peldone .
183	Cotes, Hugh de . Rob., his son Patyngtone, Steph. de	—	Will. de Folkestone de Skartheborghe
184	Cotone, Jo., de Repynghale	—	Hawise, daughter of Hugh de Brunn
185	Coyners, Rob. de, de Tanwell Thotel, Geoff.	—	Walt. Galle de Sal- fletby
186	Croppill, Rog. de . Croppill, Will. de Cursan, Will. .	— B.	Will. de Notingham .
187	Crosholm, Jo. de . Martone, Nich. de	Bs. of H. of Well . .	Hugh, son of Rob. Joweyn de Stonwe
188	†Croteman, Hen. .	Clerk, minister of King, once S.S. of Norfolk	Jo. de Ronhale, chap- lain
189	Ditto	ditto	Valentine de Schotford
190	Ditto, and Sumter, Regin. le Plucling, Rog. Carpenter, Hamo	ditto	Isabel, daughter of Rob. Plucling

Offence	Result	Reference-membrane	County
Seizure of goods, contempt of writ, false returns	—	5, 28d, 36d, 55, 63, 63d*, 73d, 77d . . .	Salop, Leic.
Illtreatment . . .	—	18, 20*, 36, 36d, 55, 64d . . .	Salop
—	—	44d . . .	Middlesex
Illtreatment, seizure of goods	Not ministri, so <i>sine die</i>	20* . . .	Yorks.
—	Hawise did not come. <i>Jo. sine die</i>	5* . . .	Lincs.
—	—	36, 60 . . .	Lincs.
—	Will. did not come. <i>Rog. sine die</i>	5* . . .	Notts.
—	—	41 . . .	Lincs.
Wounding, false writ, seizure, im- prisonment	—	4d* . . .	Norfolk
—	—	29 . . .	Norfolk
—	—	44d . . .	Norfolk

—	Name of Accused	Office	Accuser
191	†Croteman, Hen., Sumter, Regn. le Olegon, Jo.	Clerk, minister of King, once S.S. of Norfolk	Jo. de Wyttonne (Jo. de Ronhale, his attorney)
192	Ditto and Staneford, Will. de	ditto	Rich. Maylle . . .
193	Crundale, Rob. de .	Once B. of H. of Borne [King's Sombourn?]	Rob. de Wytefeld .
194	Curpel, Jo. . . .	—	Nich., son of Phil. de Neubaud
195	†Dalling, Rich. de ¹ .	B. of H. of Holt . . .	Barth. de Benevile .
196	David, Rog., son of Burgoyne, Tho. Clariceman, Hen. Abyndone, Hen. de †Fenstrete, Tho. de Rothekoc, Steph. Foel, Hen. le Patemere, Jo. de King, Hen. le Dod, Rob. †Seblame, Jo. Skot, Rob. Veyse, Hen. le Saleman, Jo. Will., son of Ralph Jazard, Will. Gikel, Will. Rus, Martin le Rob., son of Tho. Smith †Ingholf, Jo. Warde, Jo. le	Bs. of Cambridge . . .	Tho. of Excestre and Alice his wife

¹ Also spelt Dallynges.

Offence	Result	Reference-membrane	County
Illtreatment, indictment in court Christian	—	45, 49d* . . .	Norfolk
Seizure of beasts .	—	45, 48*, 56 . . .	Norfolk
False accusation, ill-treatment	Rob. in M. Rob. de Crundale <i>sine die</i>	8d, 27* . . .	Hants.
—	—	40d	Norfolk
Seizure of a horse .	—	58d, 75*, 76 . . .	Norfolk
Seizure, imprisonment, seizure of goods	Case already tried elsewhere. Accused <i>sine die</i>	30, 37d, 45d, 49d*	Cambs.

—	Name of Accused	Office	Accuser
197	Deneys, Tho. . Pusye, Rich. de Afford, Rob. de Newelaunde, Rich. de la Lenham, Jo. de Vernail, Almaric de	Late S. of Oxon. Coroner	Geoff. de Botyefeud .
198	Deneys, Will. de Knavenekote	—	Jo., son of Rob. .
199	Despenser, Geoff. le	King's B. of Ashwell .	Will. de Assewelle .
200	Dive, Ralph . .	Coroner of Northants .	Ralph de Catesby .
201	Doger, Tho. . .	S.B. of H. of Freebridge .	Will. Hautepe . .
202	Doggestone, Walt. de	B. of Derby . . .	Rich. Laveroke . .
203	Draper, Rich. le .	Once mayor of Bristol .	Martin le Tannour de Bristoll
204	Druel, Baldwin .	—	—
205	Duraunt, Walt. .	—	Will. de Horneby .
206	Durham, Andr. de .	—	. . . Henxeye . .
207	Edmunds St., Geoff. de	Constable of Norwich Castle	Reyner de Colekirke .
208	Elham, Hen. de .	Seneschal of Bishop of Rochester	Hugh le Taylour .

Offence	Result	Reference-membrane	County
—	Geoff. did not come. Accused <i>sine die</i>	20d* . . .	Berks.
—	Charge not pursued .	73* . . .	Devon
Seizure of goods .	Geoff. <i>sine die</i> . Will. in M.	10* . . .	Herts.
—	—	29 . . .	Northants.
Distrain, damage .	No proof. Accused <i>sine die</i>	7d* . . .	Norfolk
—	—	59, 67d . . .	Derbys.
Seizure of goods .	Martin did not come. Accused <i>sine die</i>	38*, 40d* . . .	Gloucs.
—	—	8 . . .	Herts.
—	Will. did not come. Accused <i>sine die</i>	30* . . .	Lincs.
—	—	60d . . .	Torn off [Oxon]
—	Reyner did not come. Geoff. <i>sine die</i>	30, 40d* . . .	[Norfolk]
Making false re- turns, through favour	Hen. <i>sine die</i> . Hugh in M.	13d* . . .	Kent

—	Name of Accused	Office	Accuser
209	Elmeswelle, Ad. de	B. of Westriding [Lindsey]	Walt. de la Lynde .
210	Ely, Jo. de . .	Clerk	Rog., son of Rich. de St. Augustine
211	Esthop, Jo. de . Batte, Rob. . .	Once S.S. Staff. and Salop B. of H. of Offlow	Will. de Knapton .
212	Eulenaryke, Will. de Creppe, Will. Hamund, Rob.	Bs. of H. of Longbridge .	Steph. le Cuteler and Alice his wife
213	Evvelode, Rich. de Clerk, Jo. Wiche, Walt. le	—	Walt. de Duntone .
214	Farndone, Tho. de Morys, Jo.	S. of Warwick [1285] B. of Knightlow	Rich. de Neubold .
215	Ditto, and Morys, Jo.	ditto B. of Knightlow . .	Sim., son of Geoff. le Fevre de Herdeborwe
216	Ditto	ditto	Will. le Venur ¹ de Herdborwe
217	Ditto, and Lynye, ² Ad.	ditto Minister of King	Jo. de Manecastre .
218	Farndone, Rob. de	B.	Walt. le Blound .
219	Fenne, Phil. de .	Coroner	Rich., son of Paulinus de Saham. Joan his wife

¹ Also spelt Venour.² Also spelt Linie.

Offence	Result	Reference-membrane	County
—	—	5	Lincs.
—	—	29, 45	Norfolk
Non - execution of writ	—	30d, 50d*, 61 . .	Staffs. and Salop
Imprisonment, seizure of goods	—	9d*	Sussex
—	Walt. did not come. Accused <i>sine die</i>	18d*	Worcesters.
Imprisonment .	—	55d, 61*, 67, 76d	Warwicks.
Imprisonment .	—	55d, 62d*, 67, 76d	Warwicks.
Imprisonment .	—	56, 61*, 67 . .	Warwicks.
—	Jo. did not come. Tho. de Farndone etc. <i>sine die</i>	20d*, 40d, 55 . .	Warwicks.
—	—	37	Dorset
Rescue of goods distrained upon, beating, damage	Accusers did not come eventually. Fenne <i>sine die</i>	26*, 37d	Norfolk

—	Name of Accused	Office	Accuser
220	Fentone, Jo. de . Okemechone, Will. de Schillingford, Phil. de	Once mayor of Exeter . Bs.	Will. Norman . . .
221	Ferreres, Rob. de .	Sub-escheator of Norfolk	Sim. Chuket de Wesen- ham
222	Ferrou, Will. le .	S. B. of Bridport . . .	Walt. le Blount . . .
223	Fleming, Ad. le .	—	Hen. de Lichfield, <i>qui sequitur pro rege</i>
224	Flemyng, Jo. le . Soleby, Rob. de .	B. of [H. of] Peak . . ditto	Avice, who was wife of Tho. Martin
225	Flode, Nich. de la .	B.	Nich. de Halybrone .
226	Forde, Steph. de la	B. of H. of Carlford .	Jo. Bond de Martles- ham
227	Ditto	ditto	Will. de la Brendhalle
228	Ditto	ditto	Geoff. de Costesheye .
229	Fotur, Rob. le . Laurenz, Tho. Porteys, Jo., de Bertham	S.B. of Odiham . . .	Austin de Bertham .
230	Foxeleye, Jo. de .	King's minister in liberty of Westminster	Hen. de Longvile de Norham

Offence	Result	Reference-membrane	County
—	—	37, 56 . .	Devon
Seizure of corn .	Eventually, accusers did not come. Rob. <i>sine die</i>	15* . .	Norfolk
False returns .	Charge withdrawn .	35* . .	Dorset
Non - production of jury	—	72d*, 77 . .	Notts.
Non - execution of writ	—	2d*, 37d, 53d, 66	Derbys.
—	—	5d . .	Hants.
Seizure of beasts, imprisonment, ill-treatment	—	2* . .	Suffolk
—	Money paid to Hen. de Lichfield, 'clericus assignatus' of Will. de Brendhalle	5, 29 . .	Suffolk
—	—	41, 45 . .	Suffolk
—	—	59 . .	Hants.
Seizure of goods .	Not a minister, so <i>sine die</i> . Hen. in M.	3, 31d* . .	Middlesex

—	Name of Accused	Office	Accuser
231	Foxtone, Jo. de .	Minister of King in town of Eastling	Margery, daughter of Arnold de Eslyngges
232	†Fraunceys, Steph. le †Fraunceys, Will. le Rob., son of Pet. †Risseby, Jo. de Skot, Will. Hull, Steph. del Rikeward, Alan	Bs. of Holderness . . .	Odelina de Skypese . .
233	†Fraunceys, Will. le †Skot, Will. †Rysseby, Jo. de †Steph., son of Will. Fraunceys †Duke, Ralph †Atte Enge, Tho. Rob., son of Pet., †Ingram, Steph. †Hulle, Steph. de Lambyn, Rob.	B. of H. of Holderness . .	Emma de Skypese de Oteringham
234	Frethenstede, Will. de	B.	Rob. de Gravenoy . .
235	Fuke, ¹ Nich. . . Vestiarie, Jo. del Gayoler, Wal. le Skynston, Jo.	Bs. of St. Edmund's . .	Christiana Henye and Rich. de Braunford
236	Galon, Jo. . . .	B. of Newport Pagnell . .	Pet. le Fevre
237	Gamage, Hen. . . Servant, Phil. le Ask, Rob. le	B. of Oxford	Tho. de Somerton and wife

¹ Also spelt Fouk.

Offence	Result	Reference-membrane	County
Imprisonment, seizure of goods	—	52d* . .	Kent
—	—	76 . . .	Yorks.
Seizure of goods, imprisonment	Steph., son of Will., not concerned. Rest committed to gaol. Emma to recover her losses	20d, 34*, 36, 53, 68, 74, 76	Yorks.
—	Rob. did not come. Accused <i>sine die</i>	68d, 74* . .	Kent
Imprisonment	Case removed to court of abbot	8d, 28* . .	Suffolk
—	Pet. did not come. Accused <i>sine die</i>	25* . . .	Bucks.
—	Tho. withdrew. Accused <i>sine die</i>	8d* . . .	Oxon.

—	Name of Accused	Office	Accuser
238	†Gamage, Hen. Rob., son of Hugh Rob. de Welles	B. of Oxford . . . S.B. Late B. of Oxford	Will. de Wodestoke .
239	Ditto, and †Colesburn, Will. de †Milton, Rob. de †Wyringges, ¹ Rog.	Bs. of Oxford . . .	Tho. de Somerton and wife
240	Ditto, and Pry, Andr. de	ditto . . .	Hen. de Chikenwelle
241	Gatton, Hamo de .	S. of Kent . . .	Rob. de Lenham, ex- ecutor of Alice de Gatton
242	Gayton, Ralph de . Wykingby, Will. de Lung, Hugh le Wrangel, Walt. de Alke, Ad.	Once mayor of Lancaster . Bs.	Jo. Scoille . . .
243	Germanus, ² son of Rich.	S.B. of King in H. of Hythe	Mary de Flexmere ³ .
244	Gernemuta, Will. de	—	Geoff. Oliver . . .
245	Geryngs, Mich. de .	B. of Teynham . . .	Ad. le Fever . . .
246	Gillot, Jo. . . .	B. of King . . .	Walt., son of Mildred
247	*Gilward, Hen. . Hogg, Tho. Wolryk, Rog.	—	*Jo. de Houtone . . .

¹ Also spelt Wyring.² Also Gervasius.³ Also spelt Flaxmere.

Offence	Result	Reference-membrane	County
Seizure, imprisonment, so that Will. could not go to Welsh war	Accused etc. <i>sine die</i> . Will. in M.	5d, 14d*	Oxon.
Seizure of Alice, and, with Milton and Wýryngges, imprisonment	Gamage etc. <i>sine die</i> . Tho. and wife in M. for false claim. Then case pursued further	48d*, 55, 57, 60d, 75d	Oxon.
Non - execution of writ	Gamage <i>sine die</i> . Hen. in M.	14*, 24, 32, 45d	Oxon.
Seizure of deceased's goods	Co-executor called for. Hamo <i>sine die</i> . Rob. in M.	52d* . . .	Kent.
—	—	28d . . .	Lancs.
Seizure of corn, ill-treatment, unjust levy	Charge withdrawn. Mary in M. But charge true, so Germanus in M.	5d, 24*, 25, 54 . .	Herts.
—	—	5d . . .	Suffolk, Northants.
—	—	56 . . .	Kent.
—	—	8 . . .	Yorks.
—	—	73d, 77d . .	Norfolk.

—	Name of Accused	Office	Accuser
248	†Glovere, Jo. le . Hull, Jo. del . Evyntone, Rich. de Pestur, Jo. le .	—	Werwella Hathewy .
249	Godeshale, Geoff. de	—	Elias, clerk of Bristol
250	Golafre, Rich. .	B. of Colchester . . .	Will. Franke, vicar of Doverkyrke
251	Ditto, and Bruet, Rich.	ditto	Ad. le Mouner and wife
252	Goldyngtone, Will. de Wynde, Tho.	Late mayor of Appleby . His clerk	Will. de Stirkeland .
253	†Graftone, Alan de . Porter, Will. le Brangweyn, Ad.	Bs. of the King . . .	Felicia, who was wife of Tho. Russel de Alyncestre
254	Ditto	ditto	Hugh Blome de Tape- feld
255	Ditto	—	Hen. de Lychefeld <i>qui sequitur pro rege</i>
256	Graham, Jo. de . Sampson, Matt.	B. of town of York . .	Walt. de Bernethorp .
257	†Grapynel, Hen. .	S. of Essex and Herts. . [1290]	Rob. Huberd de Wyt- notele

Offence	Result	Reference-membrane	County
Illtreatment, stealing royal writs, imprisonment .	Case previously tried. As to stealing, Werwella to recover losses. As to imprisonment, Glovere <i>sine die</i>	45, 53d, 59, 69*, 76d	Herefords.
—	—	64d . . .	Gloucesters.
Seizure of goods .	Eventually, Will. did not come. Rich. <i>sine die</i>	10d*, 18d . .	Essex
Delay of assize .	Ad. in M. Accused <i>sine die</i>	4*, 14, 26d . .	Essex
—	—	18, 37 . . .	Westmoreland
—	—	67, 73, 74d . .	Warwicks.
Not distraining Pet. de Molyngtone	—	70*, 76d . . .	Essex
Retirement in contempt of court in case v. R. Huberd	—	70d*	Essex
—	—	41d	Yorks.
Imprisonment .	Charge withdrawn. So in M. Accused <i>sine die</i>	70*	Essex

—	Name of Accused	Office	Accuser
258	Graunt, Rob. le, de Langwathe Tokesforde, Hugh de	Bs. in H. of Scarsdale	Rich. Goldynge
259	Grenehulle, Sim. de	S. of Worcesters. [1286]	Will. Olyver
260	Gretforde, Rob. de	B. of H. of Flaxwell	Alice, who was wife of Ralph Drepcot
261	Grey, Will. le, de Mikelcornered	—	Tho. le Verdoun
262	Gyves, Rob. de	—	Steph. de Depham
263	Hales, Rog. de	Coroner of Norfolk	Steph. de Sulberling- ham, and Regin. his brother
264	Halesworthy, ¹ Jo. de	Once sub-escheator of Devon	Jo. de Boyvile
265	Ditto	ditto	Walt. de Somerset <i>qui sequitur pro rege</i>
266	†Halesworthy, Will. de	Parson of church of Lan- hern ²	Will. Devenays de Knavetrok
267	†Hamound, Rob.	B. of Scarborough	Jo. de Thorstaneby
268	Ditto	ditto	Rog. le Fareman de Scarborough
269	Ditto	ditto	Jo. de Crauncewyk

¹ Also spelt Haldesworth.² Lanhern, in Cornwall, is the modern parish of St. Mawgan (MS. *la Hirne*).

Offence	Result	Reference-membrane	County
Sustaining Richard's adversary	—	3*	Derbys.
Grenehulle kept goods levied for debts, so that they were levied afresh by new sheriff	Eventually, Olyver did not come. Grenehulle <i>sine die</i>	11d*	Northants.
—	—	41	Lincs.
—	Tho. did not come. Grey <i>sine die</i>	8	Suffolk
—	—	3, 29, 44, 56	Middlesex
—	—	5	Norfolk
Unjust levy of money	—	3d, 28, 37d, 55, 65*, 73d	Devon
—	—	60	Devon
—	—	75d.	Devon
—	Jo. recovered money	4, 20d*	Yorks.
—	—	59	Yorks.
—	—	58, 64, 67d, 73, 77	Yorks.

—	Name of Accused	Office	Accuser
270	Handewyne, Walt. .	B. of H. of Samford .	Hugh de Spanneby .
271	Hayward, Hamo le	Late B. of Shepway .	Jo. Ode de Faversham .
272	Ditto	ditto	Regin. Whyte de Freth- enested
273	Hel, Hen. del, de Storm	B. itinerant in Essex .	Jo. de la Forde <i>qui sequitur pro rege</i>
274	Helmeswell, Ad. de	—	Mich. de Lytleport .
275	Herdeby, Geoff. de Lyndeby, Tho. de Lathe, Sim. de la Overton, Hugh de Will, his son	Bs.	Jo. de Bellam . .
276	Herthewyk, ¹ Will. de	Coroner of Warwicks. .	Hugh de Louthier <i>qui sequitur pro rege</i>
277	Hewen, Rog. de la .	B. of King in Stannary, Devon	Will. de Horsham .
278	Heys, Tho. del, de Tasseburg	Hundredman of Deepwade	Walt. Wynne- feryngges
279	Heythe, Pet. de	S.B. in H. of Gallow and Brothercross	Jo. de Kokeforde .
280	Hoddeshoke, Hen. de	—	Will. de Catteclive .
281	Holmstede, Jo. de	B. of King in H. of Ongar	Steph. de la More .

¹ Also spelt Herdwyk.

Offence	Result	Reference-membrane	County
—	—	6d	Suffolk.
Imprisonment .	Ode in M. Hamo <i>sine die</i>	52*, 60d . . .	Kent
Illtreatment . .	Regin. to recover losses. Hamo in M.	25d, 27*, 56d .	Kent
Placing kinsmen of accused on jury (in case of Mouner <i>v. Golafre</i>)	—	27d	Essex.
—	—	41, 55d, 66d .	Lincs.
Imprisonment .	Jo. de Bellam did not come. Accused <i>sine die</i>	18, 34*, 36, 44d*	Notts.
Taking bribes for execution of duty	To be tried by next justices itinerant in Warwick	26*	Warwicks.
Seizure of horse etc.	To go to Exchequer and plead there	3*	Devon
Seizure of beasts .	—	51*	Norfolk
Sealing doors so that Jo. could not ad- minister goods	—	26*	Norfolk
—	—	5d	Derbys.
Seizure of beasts by Rog. le Weyte, S.B.	—	24d*	Essex

—	Name of Accused	Office	Accuser
282	Homeden Jo.	Clerk of Rog. Inkepenne	Jocelin de la Grave
283	Hortone, Will. de Frenne, Guy del Horewod, Jo. de, de Thelbrigge	King's B. Parson of Swalecliffe	Rob., son of Laurence de Bramlinge
284	Hothom, Nich. de Hothom, Tho. de	—	Will. de Helmwell, parson of Neutone in Kesteyvene
285	Hoylande, Rob. de Kenerdale, Alex. de Ad., Rob., Rich., his sons Elias, his brother Horton, Ad.	Constable of the Peace in Lancs.	John Denyas ¹
286	Hunstanestun, Rob. de Crowe, Jo.	Prior of Cokesford	Andr. de Lavenham and wife
287	Huntingfeld, Ra- nulf de	—	Will., son of Geoff. de Pykyhale
288	Ialkes, Will. ²	Late S. of Lincs.	Rich. de Prestone
289	Ielgate, Denis de ³	Coroner of Kent	Eleanor de St. Paulo
290	† Inkepenne, Reg. de ⁴ † Walyngforde, Alan de	S. of Cornwall [1285, 1286, 1302]	Rich. de Trevaga ⁵

¹ Also spelt Denias.² Probably an under-sheriff. His name does not appear in *List of Sheriffs*. In m. 25 he is described as 'nuper ballivus.'³ Also spelt Deuategate. In the Eyre Rolls of Kent, 21 Edw. I. (No. 374 in the Public Record Office, m. 3) he is described as D. de Ildhallegate.⁴ Also spelt Ingkepenne, Ingepenne.⁵ Also spelt Treveren.

Offence	Result	Reference-membrane	County
—	—	60, 68, 74 . . .	Wilts.
Seizure, imprisonment	Guy <i>sine die</i> . Rog. in M. Will. and Jo. <i>sine die</i>	5, 14* . . .	Kent
Collusion with adversary	Day given before Bishop of Winchester	55, 58*, 64, 68 . .	Lincs.
(1) Seizure of goods, illtreatment	—	2*, 2d, 3d*, 6*, 18d, 25d, 44 . .	Lancs.
(2) Illtreatment of boy			
(3) Unjust distraint			
—	—	56d . . .	Norfolk
—	—	28 . . .	Yorks.
—	In end, Rich. did not come. Will. <i>sine die</i>	25, 29d, 40d . .	Lincs.
Sustaining adversary	—	8d, 23d* . . .	Kent
Unjust attachment, imprisonment	—	8, 63d, 72d, 74, 76, 77d	Cornwall

—	Name of Accused	Office	Accuser
291	Inkepenne, Rog. de	ditto	Rog. de Madokes-loud ¹
292	Ditto	ditto	Rich. Batekoc de Bodmine
293	Ditto Walyngeforde, Alan de †Burne, Hen. de Geoff., vicar of Lanrat Waleys, Walt. le Hellelond, Rog. de Tregor, Jo. de Tod, Rog. Seygnur, Will. le Greg, Jo. Hallynges, Will.	ditto Clerk	Jo. de Kilgate ² . . . Jo. Kytpernetete Trewake, Rich. Derewyn, Will.
294	Inkepenne, Rog. de Danvers, Tho.	S. of Cornwall . .	Mark de Trewalder .
295	Inkepenne, Rog. de	ditto	Will. de la Coudrye ³
296	Ditto, and Brunner, Hen. de Percher, Jo. le Botelo, Rob. de Wyndeforme, Tho. Gascoyn, Gerard le Lyveny, Jo. de Croyte, Rich. de la Loung, Jo. le Hostone, Will. de Hoveden, Pet. de	ditto Clerks, late hundredmen and bailiffs	Hen. Canel . . .
297	Irlaund, Jo. de .	—	Hen. le Criour of Oxford.

¹ Also spelt Madduckesloud.² Also spelt Gilgate.³ Also spelt Coudray.

Offence	Result	Reference-membrane	County
—	—	64d, 67, 73d .	Cornwall
—	Batekoc recovered money	36d, 56d . .	Cornwall
—	—	53d, 64 . .	Cornwall
Seizure of land	—	64*, 67, 73d .	Cornwall
—	—	67, 74d	Cornwall
—	—	53d . . .	Cornwall
Illtreatment . .	—	70d* . . .	Middlesex

—	Name of Accused	Office	Accuser
298	Irlaund, Rob. de	—	Ralph le Taylour Jo. his son
299	†Kempe, Geoff. Halteben, ¹ Christopher Lageman, Alex. Skate, Tho. Melvestre, Walt.	Keeper of Ipswich . . . S.B. Clerk	Albreda Parmyhod . . .
300	Kempe, Geoff. Halteben, Christopher Thweyte, Tho. de	Keeper of Ipswich . . .	Nich. de Halstede . . .
301	Kempe, Geoff. Costyn, Jo.	ditto Keeper of gaol at Ipswich	Rich. Loveband, clerk of Archdeacon of Suffolk
302	Ditto, and Costyn, Jo. Halteben, Christopher Scate, Tho. Fot, Rog. Rog., son of Silvester	Keeper of Ipswich . . . Keeper of gaol at Ipswich Coroner of Ipswich	Pet. de Melles . . .
303	Kempe, Geoff. Page, Jo.	Keeper of Ipswich . . . Clerk of S. of Norfolk . .	Hen. de Lychefeld <i>qui sequitur pro rege</i>
304	Kempe, Geoff. Scate, Tho. Altebe, Christopher Costancyn, Jo. Balheued, Rob. Siblaund, Rob.	Keeper of Ipswich . . .	Rob. Blome and Isolde his wife

¹ Also spelt Haltebe.

Offence	Result	Reference-membrane	County
Putting wrong man on jury, in case of Rochale v. Taver- ner	Rob. <i>sine die</i> . Jo. in M.	72	Notts.
Seizure of goods, imprisonment	Christopher, Alex., Tho., Walt. <i>sine die</i> . Charge against Geoff. with- drawn	6d, 29, 40 . . .	Suffolk
—	All <i>sine die</i> . Nich. in M.	38*, 45d, 53, 58d	Suffolk
False appeal, seizure	—	13*	Suffolk
False appeal, impri- sonment	—	38d*, 40d, 53d .	Suffolk
Non - execution of writ	—	38*	Norfolk
—	Rob. did not come. Kempe etc. <i>sine die</i>	40d*, 41d . . .	Norfolk

—	Name of Accused	Office	Accuser
305	Kempe, Geoff. . Boxford, Will. de . Oysel, Pet.	Keeper of Ipswich . . Late B. of Hartismere	Ad. de Lenne, clerk
306	Kempe, Geoff. .	Keeper of Ipswich . .	Jo. de Osemon, mer- chant
307	Ditto, de Wenerde- stone	ditto	Will., son of Ranulf de Berwholt
308	Ditto	ditto	Tho. de Born, parson of Long Stratton
309	†Keyvile, Jo. de . Beaumer, Rob. de	—	Will. de Keleseye .
310	Klut, Rich. ¹ . . Eddeger, Pat. de	S. of Northumberland [1288] S.B.	Will., son of Will. de Wardoun
311	Kressingham, Nich. de Kaustone, Hugh de Arnald, Jo.	—	Ad. le Fraunceys de Farnham Jo. de Waddone Jo. his brother
312	Kyngestone, Pet. de	B. of H. of Harlow . .	Hen. de Westbery, clerk
313	Leghe, Hen. de la	—	Theob. de Merke
314	Laneford, Rich. de	Clerk	Warin, son of Jo. de Kirketon
315	Lek, Rich. le, de Adelyngtone	—	Will. Gene de Ade- lyngtone, and son

¹ Also spelt Knout.

Offence	Result	Reference-membrane	County
—	Ad. did not come. Ac- cused <i>sine die</i>	44, 54, 55*, 60 .	Suffolk
Seizure of goods .	Jury confirmed Jo.'s story	64d, 69*, 72 .	Suffolk
Levying money .	—	15* . . .	Suffolk
—	—	25d . . .	[Norfolk or Suffolk]
Illtreatment, on two occasions	—	53d, 62*, 71, 74	Yorks.
—	—	28d, 40 . . .	Northumber- land
—	—	30, 54, 59, 66, 73d	Norfolk Suffolk
Seizure of beasts .	Hen. did not come. Pet. <i>sine die</i>	64d* . . .	Essex
—	Theobald to recover losses. Hen. commit- ted to gaol. Hen. of Lychefeld appears for the Crown	23*, 44d, 53d, 71	Essex
—	—	29 . . .	Lancs.
—	—	54 . . .	Lincs.

—	Name of Accused	Office	Accuser
316	Lenne, Alan de .	S.B. of Derby . . .	Rich. de Thorp . .
317	Leverer, Pet. le . „ Will. le .	B. of H. of Chilford .	Alan Osemound . .
318	Ditto . . .	ditto	Hugh de Alditheleye .
319	Lucie, Fulk de .	S. of Warwicks. and Leicesters. [1287]	Rich. de Loges . .
320	Ditto, and Waleys, Will. le Grashale, Tho. de ¹ Nottingham, Hen. de	ditto	Will., son of Jo. de Kegworth
321	Lucie, Fulk de Barwe, Rog. de Palmer, Will. de	ditto S.S. S.B.	Hen., son of Roaldus .
322	Luscote, Jo. de . Hinon, Will. Hennemers, Tho. ²	Constable of Peace in H. of Braunton	Jos. Scompe . . .
323	Luthis, Jo. de ³ .	Mayor of Wallingford .	a. Gilb., son of Bar- tholomew, and Alan his brother b. Eustace le Orfevre Rob. le Orfevre
324	Lynge, Jo. . . . Rog., son of Walt. Flemyng, Hugh le Passe, Ad. ⁴	—	Jo. le Fevre . . .
325	Maldon, Jo. de .	Late clerk of Will. de Suthwell, mayor of Kingston	Matilda, wife of Will. le Gaunter de Kynge- stone

¹ Also spelt Garsale.² Also spelt Hemmers.³ Also spelt Louthis.⁴ Also spelt Pus.

Offence	Result	Reference-membrane	County
—	—	59, 67d . . .	Derbys.
—	—	59d . . .	Cambs.
—	—	59d . . .	Cambs.
Seizure of oxen .	Rich. in M. Fulk <i>sine die</i>	11d* . . .	[Warwicks.]
Non - execution of writs	Charge withdrawn against Tho. de Gar-sale. In end, Will. did not come, so Fulk <i>sine die</i>	20d, 21* . . .	Warwicks.
Imprisonment .	Rog. <i>sine die</i> . . .	44, 55d, 65*, 65d*,	Warwicks.
False returns	Charge against Fulk withdrawn	66d	Leicesters.
Imprisonment .	—	28, 35*, 55 .	Devon
—	—	67 . . .	Berks.
Imprisonment .	—	22d*, 35d. .	Berks.
—	Jo. le Fevre did not come. Lynge etc. <i>sine die</i>	5d, 25d* . . .	Herts.
—	—	44, 54d, 60d, 62, 68	Surrey

—	Name of Accused	Office	Accuser
326	Mare, Pet. de la ¹ . Manegotefeld, Rich. de Draper, Rich. le Fraunceys, Walt. Forester, Jo. le Westminster, Tho. de Den, John de Calne, Rich. de Loung, Rich. le Stretton, Ad. de Burton, Sim. de	Constable of Bristol Bs.	Elias, clerk of Bristol
327	Mare, Pet. de la . Berners, Rich. de	Constable of Bristol Keeper of the gaol	Rob., son of Gilb. le Espicer
328	Mare, Pet. de la .	Constable of Bristol	Phil. le Espicer
329	Mariot, Jo., de Pake- ham	—	Jo. Germeyn de Risse- brok
330	Martel, Warin, de magna Dunmawe	Constable of the Peace	Walt., son of Will. Paykyn
331	Martin, Jo. . . Mewale, Jo. Duntone, Will. de Combertone, Regin. de Sutton, Gilb. de Gernin, Jo. Sherewynd, Tho. Chaumbre, Rog. de la	Once mayor of Cambridge Bs.	Sim. le Dore . . .

¹ Also spelt More.

Offence	Result	Reference-membrane	County
Imprisonment .	—	58* . . .	Gloucesters.
Making false will to disinherit Rob.	—	38d*, 60d, 72, 74d	Gloucesters.
Seizure of horse .	—	65*, 66d . . .	Gloucesters.
—	—	44 . . .	Suffolk
Distraint unjustly .	Walt. withdrew. There- fore in M.	2d* . . .	Essex
Unjust imprison- ment, seizure of goods	Martin and Will. de Duntone to gaol. Sim. to recover losses. As to seizure of goods, Sim. in M.	25d, 29d, 31*, 56d, 60, 68d	Cambs. Hunts.

—	Name of Accused	Office	Accuser
332	Martin, Nich., de Rexham Regin. fiz le Berther de Wymodes- ham	—	Jo. Curpel . . .
333	† Martlesham, ¹ Rog. le Chacherel, Rob. le	B. of H. of Badeberwe [Babergh ?] S.B.	Jo. Clerebaud, parson of Sulbury
334	† Matt., son of Jo. .	S. of Devon [1287] . .	Jo. de Boyville . . .
335	† Maundrel, Will. . Will., brother of Ralph Attehir- chezard Soleby, Rob. de .	Bs. of the King . . B. of H. of the Peak	Avice, wife of Tho. Martin de Tides- welle
336	Maundrel, Will. . Jovene, Sim. le . Newbolt, Hugh de Tapptone, Ad. de	B. of Scarsdale . . B. of Chesterfield	Will. de Catelive . .
337	Maundrel, Will. .	B. of Scarsdale . . .	Rich. de Stratton . .
338	Ditto . . .	ditto . . .	Jo. de Bremyngtone . .
339	Ditto . . .	ditto . . .	Tho. de Leyes . . .
340	Maunderil, Gilb. de	Once B. of Wallingford . .	Will. de Canville . .
341	Melho, Rog. de .	Clerk to Sheriff . . .	Ral. de Boxstede . .
342	Merdene, Tho. de .	B. of King . . .	Pet. de Pacham . .

¹ Also spelt Markesham.

Offence	Result	Reference-membrane	County
Seizure of beasts .	—	42d*, 50d, 59d .	Norfolk
Seizure of grain, on pretext of King's fifteenth	Rog. <i>sine die</i> . But Ralph guilty, and Rog., as responsible, in M. Jo. recovered losses	18, 26d*, 45d, 53, 56d, 59d, 60, 68	Suffolk
—	—	64	Devon.
—	—	5, 64d	Derbys.
—	—	41, 54, 56, 59d .	Derbys.
—	—	20, 36d, 54 .	Derbys.
—	—	30	Derbys.
Illtreatment, seizure of beasts	—	56, 67d, 75d*, 76	Derbys.
Had cart repaired without paying	—	52d*	Berks
—	—	10d, 18d . . .	Essex
Annoyance, defamation	In end, Pet. did not come. Tho. <i>sine die</i>	47*, 53 . . .	Kent

	Name of Accused	Office	Accuser
343	Merowe, ¹ Tho. de . Pageham, Will. de	<i>Loco</i> S. of Sussex . . . S.	Reg. de Tyreshegge and wife Emma
344	Ditto	ditto de Hereford .
345	Modi, Rich. . . .	B. of H. of Mue . . .	Juliana de Ammori .
346	+Molyngton, Pet. de	Sub-escheator of Essex .	Will. atte Pond . .
347	Ditto	ditto	Nich. de Halstede .
348	Monesle, Nich. de .	B. of Gt. Yarmouth .	Jo. Ede de Fileby .
349	More, Jo. de la . .	B. in Lincoln	Rob. Peron de Routheby
350	Mosewell, Rog. de, and his servants	Coroner of Kent . . .	Jo. atte Broune . .
351	Mouncy, Ral. de .	—	Rob. Joye Jo. Wade Ral. de la Haye
352	Moyne, Alan le . .	B. of Albingtone . . .	Alan, son of Ad. de Albingtone
353	Moyne, Alan le . .	Constable of the Peace .	Will. de Berle de Abington
354	Munt, Jo. le . . .	—	Jo. Joce
355	Myngy, Rob. . . .	B. of H. of Dunmow .	Jo. Wyther

¹ Also spelt Merue.

Offence	Result	Reference-membrane	County
Neglect of two writs. Delaying execution of writ	Reg. and Emma withdrew. In M.	1* . . .	Sussex
—	—	58d . . .	Sussex
Seizure of beasts .	Sheriff and coroners in M. for non-production and false returns	28, 40, 49*, 59d.	Bucks
—	—	29d, 56, 59d, 68d, 74	Essex
—	—	40d . . .	Essex
—	—	25d . . .	Norfolk
—	Rob. did not come. More <i>sine die</i>	55 . . .	Lines.
—	Jo. withdrew. Mosewell <i>sine die</i>	8* . . .	Kent
—	Rob. Joye did not come. Ral. <i>sine die</i>	8d . . .	Suffolk
Assault, imprisonment	Alan, son of Ad., did not come. Alan le Moyne <i>sine die</i>	8, 75* . . .	Cambs.
Ejection . . .	Will. to recover losses. Fine to King	29d, 40d, 73, 75d*	Cambs.
—	—	8d	Suffolk
Procuring indictment, seizure of beasts	Rob. <i>sine die</i> . Jo. in M.	11d, 18d, 27d*	Essex

—	Name of Accused	Office	Accuser
356	Newcastle, Bertram de Botham, Laur. de Sampson, Matt. Graham, Jo.	Bs. in city of York . .	Rog. de Schireborne
357	Normanby, Rich. de Mersk, Jo. del .	Late Bs. of King in York	—
358	Northwode, Walt. de	Constable of the Peace .	Will. de Ifeld . . .
359	Nortone, Rob. de .	Clerk to S. of Rutland .	Rob. Edewyn . . .
360	Norwich, Rob. de .	Clerk to S. of Salop and Staffs.	Bokenhale, Rob. de . Pynton, Phil. de Allerwyce, Rob.
361	†Nottingham, Sim. de Makene, Ranulf de	—	Will. Fenel . . .
362	Olivestede, Jo. de .	B. of King, seneschal of Jo. de Riveres	Tho. de la More .
363	Orlaustone, Jo. de Estholte, Will. de Bradmede, Alan de Will., son of Rob. de Bradmede	Ministri . . .	Will. le Hunte and sons
364	Oygon, Rich. .	S.S. of Herts. . .	Geoff. de Rysele .
365	Pageham, Will. de Brothantone, Rich. de	S. of Sussex [1287] .	Will. Batwode de Schodenham

Offence	Result	Reference-membrane	County
—	—	29 . . .	Yorks.
—	—	30d . . .	Yorks.
Seizure, imprison- ment	Walt. <i>sine die</i> . Will. in M.	14d* . . .	Kent
—	—	37 . . .	Leicesters.
—	—	5 . . .	Staffs.
—	—	18d, 25, 26d .	Derbys.
Seizure of beasts for debt	Charge withdrawn. Jo. <i>sine die</i>	22d . . .	Essex
Imprisonment .	In end, Will. did not come. Accused <i>sine die</i>	51* . . .	Kent
Not returning in- quest	—	11d, 18 . . .	Herts., Essex
Non - execution of writ, through fa- vour	Pageham and Brotham- tone <i>sine die</i> . Will. Batwode in M.	31d* . . .	Sussex

—	Name of Accused	Office	Accuser
366	Parlour, Ral. le . Carewell, Will. de	B. of Lincoln . . .	Jo. Storme . . . Will. de Langtoft, vicar of Sutterton
367	Parlour, Ral. le . Broun, Will. with Staunford, Alex. de Wrenne, Rich.	ditto	Rob. Brian de Bas- tone
368	Paueli, Walt. .	—	Will. Johan and others
369	Paumer, Jo. le .	Mayor of Nottingham .	Joan and Margery, daughters of Will. Bugge de Notting- ham
370	Peteuyn, Hub., de Cocton	—	Tho. de Fremyngham
371	Peyntor, Rob. le .	—	Rob. de Keneburne .
372	Pire, Andr. de . Sowy, Tho. Wotesdone, Will. de, with Serjaunt, Jo. le	Bs. of Oxford	Nich. de la Berwe, Helena his wife
373	Pluket, Hugh . Ad., his son	B. of H. of West Derby .	Will. de Licestere . Juliana de Sanki Felicia de Sanki
374	Ditto . . .	ditto	Will. de la Sale .
375	Plumstede, Mich. de	Itinerant B. of Will. de Roynges, S. of Norfolk [1281]	Pet. de Heythe . .

Offence	Result	Reference-membrane	County
Seizure, imprison- ment. Seizure of horse, and other annoyances	—	5, 12d*, 19*, 36	Lincs.
Seizure, imprison- ment	—	14*, 40d . .	Lincs.
—	—	5 . . .	Wilts.
Imprisonment on trumped-up charge	—	22* . . .	Notts.
—	—	54 . . .	Norfolk
—	—	41d . . .	Essex
Extortion of money	Charge already with- drawn elsewhere : so accused <i>sine die</i> Will. de Wotesdone was never a minister : so <i>sine die</i>	19* . . .	Oxon.
—	—	20 . . .	Lancs.
—	—	8, 18. . .	Lancs.
Imprisonment	Mich. to be committed to gaol. Afterwards made fine	22d* . . .	Norfolk

—	Name of Accused	Office	Accuser
376	Podingge, Hen. de Wanele, Rich.	B. of H. of Teynham S.B.	Jo. Ode de Feveresham
377	Pontefracto, Rob. de	Late S.S. of Yorks.	Jo. de Brayton . .
378	Provost, Rog. le, . and others	B. of Camelford . .	Walt. Godman . .
379	Pupplington, Will. de	B. in Worcester . .	Will. de Wasthull .
380	Pympe, Rich. .	Constable of the Peace in H. of Twyford	Jo. de Hamstede .
381	Ditto . . .	ditto . . .	Pet. de Saxhulle .
382	Quappelade, Edm., son of Tho. de Wolle, Tho. Miles, Hugh	Coroner of Lincs. . B. Clerk	Tho., son of Juliana .
383	Ramesey, Abbot de	—	Nich., son of Legge Bindun, Rich. Dene, Will. de Hendeman, Will. Mariot, Jo. Gut, Ad. Baldewyn, Will. Rich., son of Reg. Fok, Jo. Gottinges, Pet. de Ridone, Jo. de Sporefunche, Rob. (Freemen of the town of St. Ives)

Offence	Result	Reference-membrane	County
Imprisonment, extortion of money. Favour	Ode did not come, in the end. Hen. and Rich. <i>sine die</i>	28, 39* . .	Kent
—	—	20d, 36d, 60d, 74	Yorks.
Imprisonment, seizure of goods	—	6* . . .	Cornwall
—	—	30 . . .	Worcesters.
Arrest to extort money, illtreatment	Rich. <i>sine die</i> . Jo. in M.	15d* . .	Kent
Cutting down trees etc.	Jury confirms Rich.'s defence	16* . . .	Kent
—	Tho. did not come. In M. Accused <i>sine die</i>	20d* . . .	Lincs.
Exacting customs etc. not due	Sent to common law .	12d* . . .	Hunts.

—	Name of Accused	Office	Accuser
384	Ramesey, Abbot de Gilb. Regin.	— B. S.B.	Rich. Mayle de Stokfery
385	Rede, Jo. le . . . Halkebraund, Jo. de	Bs. of King in Kent. .	—
386	Reymonde, Will. .	Once B. of H. of Kinton .	Tho. de la Bere .
387	Riby, Will. . . . Riby, Jo. Rich., son of Agnes de Thorpe Bozone, Rob. Ral., son of Walter of Thorp Alan, son of Will. de Hurby	Bs.	Walt., son of Miles, and Beatrix his wife
388	Rich.	S.B. of H. of Lothingland.	Jo., son of Will. de Neutone and Barth. Spike
389	Rigges, ¹ Ad. de .	—	Alex. le Moyne de Habintone
390	Risseby, ² Jo. de . Scot, Will. . . .	King's B. in York. . . Clerk	Will. de Cameryngtone
391	Risseby, Jo. de .	Once B. in Holderness .	Nich. le Warde de Burtone Pydse

¹ Also spelt Ruges.² Also spelt Resceby, Risceby.

Offence	Result	Reference-membrane	County
Non-execution of writ	Rich. is pleading in name of others, so abbot and bailiffs <i>sine die</i> and Rich. in M.	15* . . .	Norfolk
—	—	29 . . .	Kent
Non-execution of writ	Jury supported Will. Will. <i>sine die</i> . Tho. in M.	32* . . .	Warwicks.
—	—	40d . . .	Lines.
—	—	4, 18d, 37, 44d .	Suffolk
Imprisonment for non-fulfilment of duties before time when became S.B.	Ad. <i>sine die</i> . . .	25d, 27* . .	Cambs.
Seizure of beasts, corn, money	—	40, 50*, 59d .	Yorks.
Unjust placing on jury, though he had not 40s. worth of land	—	54d, 62*, 69, 74d, 76d	Yorks.

—	Name of Accused	Office	Accuser
392	Risseby, Jo. de .	Once B. in Holderness .	Will. de Frothingham
393	Rob., son of Henry	Mayor of Northampton .	Hen. de Longevile .
394	†Rochale, Reg. de . †London, Jo. de	Bs.	Rich., son of Geof. de Pychestede
395	Rokefeld, Rich. de	B. of King	Tho. Smalwode de la Ros
396	Roston, Hen. de . Coroner, Rob. le	King's Bs. of Scarborough	Rog. le Lorymer de Cestrefeud
397	†Russell, Andr. Hoketone, Will. de	—	Jo. Duron . . .
398	Rye, Will. de . Tyes, Bald. Pauely, Rob., son of Rob. le Hedone, Will. de .	Bs.	Will. Bateman de Appeltone
399	Rypon, Auger. de . Middletone, Tho., son of Will. of	—	Jo. de Torny . . .
400	Samford, Tho. de .	—	Jo. de Lutegarsale ¹ .
401	Sampson, Jo. . Yffard, Will. .	Late Mayor of York. B. of Archbishop.	Warh, Tho. de . Byset, Will.
402	Samson, Jo. . .	—	Rob. de Skultorpe .
403	Samson, Matt. .	B. of city of York . .	Walt. de Bernthorpe .
404	Ditto Bothom, Laur. de	Bs.	Jo. de Graham de York

¹ Also spelt Lotegersale.

Offence	Result	Reference-membrane	County
—	—	73 . . .	Yorks.
Seizure of goods .	—	7*, 18d . .	Northants.
—	—	56 . . .	Yorks.
—	Tho. withdrew. In M. Rich. <i>sine die</i>	35d* . . .	—
—	—	44 . . .	Yorks.
—	—	67d, 74 . .	Cornwall
Illtreatment, maim- ing	Rye says he was not a minister. To be jury	34d*, 36d. . .	Yorks.
—	Jo. did not come. In M. Accused <i>sine die</i>	5 . . .	Yorks.
—	—	8d, 17, 29, 40, 55	Bucks.
—	Accusers did not come. In M. Accused <i>sine die</i>	5d, 44d . .	Yorks.
Non-fulfilment of agreement	—	2d* . . .	Rutland
—	—	56d . . .	Yorks.
Not sharing re- venues with Jo., third bailiff	—	69*, 74 . .	Yorks.

—	Name of Accused	Office	Accuser
405	Sancto Laudo, Jo. de	S. of Dorset and Somerset [1283]	Nich. Choppe de Schyreborne Rob. Cromme
406	Ditto . . .	ditto . . .	Hen. le Mouner . .
407	Ditto . . .	ditto . . .	Jo. Schele de Schyre- borne Jo. le Mouner Will. Sperlynge Will. Tankarde de Schyreborne
408	Ditto and . . Wyk, Jo. de	ditto . . . S.S.	Will. de Insula . .
409	Sancto Laudo Jo. de	S. of Dorset and Somerset	Hen. Crips . .
410	Ditto . . .	ditto . . .	Jo. de Percy . .
411	Sancto Quintino, Will. de Bringham, Hugh de Richeby, Jo. de Lemor, Rob. le	Justice of gaol delivery . Clerk to S. le Conestable Bs. of Holderness	Steph. de Vham . .
412	Sandale, Will. de .	Clerk of S. . . .	Ad., son of Ranulph .
413	Sandiacre, Geoff. de	Once S. of Gloucesters. . [1287]	Ad. de Norwich, clerk .

Offence	Result	Reference-membrane	County
Imprisonment. Also bailiffs ill-treated Nich. and Rob.	Same defence as below .	19d* . . .	Dorset
Seizure, imprisonment	Sheriff says it was because Hen. ill-treated his officers sent to seize his 'claviger' Rich. de Terstwode	19*, 36 . . .	Dorset
Imprisonment .	Same defence . . .	19d*, 36, 53, 64	Dorset
Fine, selling of beasts	—	13d*, 36 . . .	Dorset
Fines, seizure of beasts	—	13d*	Dorset
—	—	25, 30d* . . .	Somerset
—	Steph. did not come. Accused <i>sine die</i>	5d*	Yorks.
—	—	20d	Lincs.
Imprisonment .	Imprisonment was for receiving a thief. So Geoff. <i>sine die</i> . Ad. in M.	13*	Gloucesters.

—	Name of Accused	Office	Accuser
414	Sandiacre, Geoff. de	Once S. of Gloucesters. . [1287]	Rog. de Waluxor .
415	Ditto . . .	ditto . . .	Rob. de Bye . . .
416	Ditto . . .	ditto . . .	Mariota de Immer .
417	Savaner, Rog. de Bruges	Clerk in the bench . .	Gilb. de la Pitte .
418	Say, Rob. de .	Once coroner of Shrop- shire	Will. de Hamme, parson of Hampton Lovet
419	Schefeld, Rob. de .	Seneschal of town of Peterborough	Hugh de Kingestone .
420	Scheppeye, Ad. de Wanel, Rich. .	— Once S.B. of [H. of] Teyn- ham	Jo. Ode de Faversham
421	Schilyngford, Phil. de	B. of liberty of Cridington	Ad. de Cridington .
422	Schireman, Will. le Flemyang, Ad. le Orfevre, Mich. le Cuppere, Rich. le	Bs. of Nottingham . .	Will. de Catteclive .

Offence	Result	Reference-membrane	County
Seizure of beasts, imprisonment	Charge withdrawn. Geoff. <i>sine die</i> . Rog. in M.	16* . . .	Gloucests.
Seizure of Rob. .	Rob. seized because he did not provide victuals for the army in Wales, when he was bailiff. Geoff. <i>sine die</i> . Rob. in M.	18* . . .	Gloucests.
Allowing prisoners to escape	—	18d* . . .	Gloucests.
Upholding Gilb.'s adversary	Rog. produced letters of protection and quit- tance	58d* . . .	Somerset
Seizure of goods .	Rob. <i>sine die</i> . Will. in M.	58d* . . .	Salop
Seizure of goods .	Hugh withdrew. In M. Rob. <i>sine die</i>	32d* . . .	Northants.
Ad. illtreated Ode. Wanel impri- soned him	By jury's report, Rich. <i>sine die</i> and Jo. in M.	56d, 60d, 62d*, 66	Kent
Seizure of beasts and imprisonment	Phil. says he was not a minister	27* . . .	Devon
—	—	68d, 76d . . .	Notts.

—	Name of Accused	Office	Accuser
423	Sefare, Ral. . . Tony, Alex.	Bs. of Colchester . . .	Will. de Oldegate . .
424	Seleby, Nich. de . Langetone, Nich. de Seleby, Tho. de	Mayor of York . . . His Bs.	Pet., son of Jo. Turgis
425	Serele, Rob. . .	Constable of the Peace in town of Ingrave	John Foucher . . .
426	Seriaunt, Geoff. le	B. of Exeter . . .	Tho. Penros . . .
427	Seriaunt, Ral. le . Bedel, Walt. Grom, Jo. le Atefole, Will. Cherringges, Luke de	Bs. of King in Kent . .	Margaret, daughter of Tho. Wyberd
428	Severne, Walt. . Skaward, Will. Dagge, Will.	Bs. of Gloucester . . .	Geoff. le Tailor, de Wyndeshon
429	Sewe, Jo. . .	B. of Oxford . . .	Nich. le Mouner . .
430	Sithingge, Rich. de Hall, Rich. del Siward, ¹ Rich. . Riche, Rich. le Osbern, Nich. Bissop, Jo. Simund, Will.	Bs. Bs. in H. of Stratton . .	Rog. of Norwich, clerk Rog. de Madokesloud
431	Siward, Rich. . .	B. of Thurstapel . . .	Walt. de la Tye ² de Goldehanger]

¹ Also spelt Sward, Syward, Styward, Stiward.² Also Will. de la Tye, Will. Attetye.

Offence	Result	Reference-membrane	County
Placing Will. on jury in case of Mouner v. Golafre, contrary to writ	—	27d* . . .	Essex
—	—	8 . . .	Yorks.
Carrying off wood.	Jo. recovered losses.	49d*, 57, 60d .	Essex
Abduction of beasts	Rob. to gaol. Made fine		
—	—	29 . . .	Devon
—	—	20d . . .	Kent
Seizure of horses and fish	—	20d, 23d* . .	Gloucests.
Breaking agreement	Nich. recovers losses. Jo. in M.	77d* . . .	Oxon.
—	—	45 . . .	Norfolk
Imprisonment	Rog. did not come. Rich. etc. <i>sine die</i>	53d, 63*, 64d, 67, 72, 73d, 77*	Cornwall
Seizure of beasts	Rich. <i>sine die</i> . Will. in M.	25d, 29d, 40, 43d*	Essex

—	Name of Accused	Office	Accuser
432	Skap, Regin. Dyme, Walt. Cole, Ad. Kerdyf, Rich. Cornwaleys, Rich. le Scherling, Will.	Bs. of Bristol . . .	Walt. de Frenshawe .
433	† Skirmissour, ¹ Jo. le Grys, Hen., de Bertone Jo., servant of Geoff. Kempe Pyronn, Hen.	Bs.	Tho. Honyngge, vicar of Besthorpe
434	Skirmissour, Jo. le Barry, Will. Ramesey, Jo. de	Bs. of Will. of Rothingge, once S. of Suffolk	Will. de Caldewelle .
435	Skot, Will. . . Lorimer, Rob.	Bs. of Holderness . . .	Pet. de Mounceus .
436	Snellestone, Will. de Molinews, Rob. de Fever, Ral. le, de Kirkeby Will., his son Kameynstre, Ral. de Kameynstre, Pat. de Will. Rich., son of Ral. Rog., servant of Rob. Molinewe Levot, Will., ser- vant of Will. de Snellestone	Bs.	William de Knaptone .

¹ Also spelt Skyrmessur.

Offence	Result	Reference-membrane	County
—	—	37	Somerset
Seizure of Tho., and imprisonment	—	61*, 64, 66, 73, 74d*	Norfolk
—	—	25	Suffolk London
Placing Pet. on jury without warning	—	68, 72d*, 76d	Yorks.
—	—	8d	Lanes.

—	Name of Accused	Office	Accuser
437	Springehus, Rog. .	Once S. of Salop and Staffs. [1278]	Urian de S. Petro .
438	Staneforde, Will. de	—	Rich. Mayle .
439	Staunford, Alex., son of Eleanor de Brenne, Rich.	—	Rob. Bryan .
440	Stok, Sim. de, de Hetham	—	Wlvena ¹ de Lectone
441	Stokelynge, Ral.	Clerk of Ad. le Bret, B. of Westperet	Walt. de Lorteye ²
442	Stowemarket, Rog. de	Late B. of Gloucester .	Sim., vicar of Bek- ford
443	Surdeyle, Rog. de . Everwyke, Tho. de Wance, Alan de .	Bs. of Boston . . .	Rich. de la Funteyn
444	Sutho, Hamo de . Comptone, ³ Jo. de	Bs. of the Honour of Boulogne	Rob., son of Steph. Alan, son of Ad. de Alyngton
445	Suttone, Gilb. de	S.S. of Hunts. . .	Warin de S. Neot .
446	Suttone, Rich. de	B. of Abbess of Barking .	Alice de Caveford .
447	Suttone, Will. de	—	Walt. Burdet, Isabel his wife . . .

¹ Also spelt Wlwina, Wolwyna.³ Also spelt Comtone.² Also spelt del Ortheye.

Offence	Result	Reference-membrane	County
Levying 100s. without giving quit-tance	Rog. says he was not a minister	23d* . .	Staffs. Salop.
—	—	59, 67 . .	Norfolk
—	—	25 . . .	Lincs.
Seizure of money. Suppression of writs	—	44, 50d*, 59d .	Norfolk
False returns, ill-treatment	Ral. to be punished at will of King [Hen. of Lich. for Kg.]. To be a jury on other points	5d, 17*, 36, 55 .	Somerset
—	—	41, 56 . .	Gloucesters.
—	—	28d . . .	Lincs.
Seizure of goods	Alan did not come. In M. Hamo and Jo. <i>sine die</i>	20d, 34* . . 36*, 44d	Essex
—	—	53 . . .	Hunts.
Imprisonment .	Alice did not come. In M. Rich. <i>sine die</i>	4d* . . .	Essex
—	—	20d . . .	Essex

—	Name of Accused	Office	Accuser
448	Sygin, Rich. .	S.B. of H. of Smithdon .	Tho. de Vilenove .
449	Talmari, Steph. .	B. of Winchester . .	—
450	Taverner, Ral. le Seriaunt, Rob. le Cursonn, Will. . Paumer, Jo. le .	Bs. of Nottingham . .	Egidius de Roshale .
451	Taverner, Ral. le Corson, Will. Champeneys, Rich. le	ditto	Rog. le Skot . .
452	Taverner, Ral. le . Lentone, Rob. .	ditto S.B.	Rob. de Stafford .
453	Tendringes, Will. le	B. of Stoke-near-Nayland	Will. le Conestable
454	Teynturele, Rich. le, de Roderham	B. of Stretford . .	Rob. de la Barre .
455	Ditto	ditto	Will. de Catlive .
456	Thornethorpe, ¹ Rich. de Rob., son of Alice †Bingtone, ² Rich. de	—	Rich., son of Everard de Bernethorpe
457	Thorntone, Greg. de	B. of H. of Staincliffe .	Walt., son of Mildred de Brocton

¹ Also spelt Thorghenthorpe, Thourhesthorpe.² Also spelt Byngtone, Byningtone.

Offence	Result	Reference-membrane	County
Seizure of horse .	Tho. did not come. In M. Richard <i>sine die</i>	29, 37d*, 53, 60, 69d*, 74	Norfolk
Wounding and ill-treatment	—	6d	Hants.
Seizure of goods and beasts	Jo. le Paumer says case already tried in county court. Jury confirms Ral.'s defence	30d, 32*, 41d, 54d, 55d, 59, 68, 72, 76d .	Notts.
—	—	18	Notts.
—	Rob. de Stafford did not come. In M. Accused <i>sine die</i>	8d*	Notts.
Pasturage on Will.'s land	In end, Will. le Constable did not come. In M. Will. le Tendinges <i>sine die</i>	40d, 48d* . .	Suffolk
—	—	25d	Yorks.
—	—	59, 71, 76. . .	Yorks.
Procuring presentation of Rich. as receiver of thieves: hence imprisonment	—	8d, 21d*, 41d, 55d, 60, 67, 77	Yorks.
—	—	56d	Yorks.

—	Name of Accused	Office	Accuser
458	Thymnor, Hugh de	Coroner of Staffs. . .	Margery, daughter of Petronilla de Strethay
459	Ditto . . .	ditto . . .	Jo. Deurdent de Fisherwyk
460	†Todenam, ¹ Rog. de	B. of Norwich . . .	Jo. de Ronhale . . .
461	Ditto, and Ely, Jo. de Bunggeye, Geoff. de Belle, Ranulf Bil, Pet.	Bs. of Norwich . . .	Simon de Skerningges, clerk
462	Todenam, Hugh de, and Hul, Will. del Hul, Hugh del Britwalde, Will. Britwalde, Tho. Britwalde, Pet.	B. of Thredling . . . S.Bs.	Rob. Fydyan de Dedeham
463	Tolet, ² Jo., de Drithlington	—	Rob. de Mirfield .
464	Tolet, ³ Roger .	King's B. . . .	John de Appirle ⁴ .
465	Tolous, Rich. .	S.B. of H. of Oswaldslow	John Coyngne, chap- lain
466	Trelusk, Andr. .	Lately justice in Devon .	Will. de Bysingham .

¹ Also spelt Tudenham, Tuddenham.³ Also spelt Tolet.² Also spelt Toylet, Typlet.⁴ Also spelt Apperle.

Offence	Result	Reference-membrane	County
Seizure of a chest .	—	1* . . .	Staffs.
Wounding, seizure of goods, vexation	—	1*, 25 . .	Staffs.
—	Jo. de Ronhale with- drew. In M. Rog. <i>sine die</i>	4d* . . .	[Norfolk]
Seizure of horse .	—	18, 38*, 57, 59, 68d, 74, 75d	Norfolk
Seizure of goods .	—	10 . . .	Suffolk
—	—	41d, 55d, 60, 73d, 76	Yorks.
—	—	20, 37, 54, 59, 68d	Derbys.
—	—	30d, 41d . .	Worcesters.
—	—	36d, 56 . .	Devon

—	Name of Accused	Office	Accuser
467	Trot, Tho., de Bergh	—	Jo. de Runhale . .
468	Turville, ¹ Will. de	S. of Beds. and Bucks. . [1288, 1291]	William de Tyvile . .
469	Ditto . . .	ditto . . .	Will. le Gardener . .
470	Ditto . . .	ditto . . .	Alan de Schenle . .
471	Ditto . . .	ditto . . .	Matilda Stanborne . .
472	Ditto . . .	ditto . . .	Austin de Westbrok . .
473	Ditto . . .	ditto . . .	Gilb. de Westbrok . .
474	Ditto . . .	ditto . . .	Regin. le Provost de Midelecleydene
475	Tylly, John, de Wyllyngham	—	Rob. Bagge . . Ranulph le Hay
476	Veyse, Walt. de . . Pus, Reg., de Lodelawe	B. of Worcester . .	Rob. Colle de Derby
477	Veyse, Walt. de . .	B. of Worcester . .	Jo. de Attilberg . .

¹ Also spelt Turvile.

Offence	Result	Reference-membrane	County
—	—	40 . . .	Norfolk
—	—	66, 68d . .	Beds. Northants.
Seizure of goods .	Will. de Turville <i>sine die</i> . Will. le Gardener in M.	10d, 11* . .	Bucks.
Seizure and imprisonment	Alan did not come. In M. Will. <i>sine die</i>	11d* . . .	Bucks.
—	—	4 . . .	Bucks.
—	—	4 . . .	Bucks.
—	—	4 . . .	Bucks.
Imprisonment and seizure of goods	Regin. in M. Turville <i>sine die</i>	9* . . .	Bucks.
—	—	8d . . .	Suffolk
Seizure of goods .	Reg. not a bailiff, so <i>sine die</i> , and Rob. in M. Rob. to recover losses against Walt. (Hen. of Lychefeld put in Colle's place)	21d*, 60d .	Worcesters.
When tenement given to certain persons, Walt., who was Jo.'s rent-collector, hindered their entrance	—	70d* . . .	Worcesters.

—	Name of Accused	Office	Accuser
478	Walesham, Rob. de Atteherne de	Once constable of Norwich Castle	Jo., son of Nich. de Ingham
479	Walesham, Rob. de Knyth, Ral. . . . Roingges, Will. de	Constable of Norwich Castle His B. Late S. of Norfolk [1281]	Pet. de Heythe . . .
480	Walesham, Rob. de Bertone, Jo. de Knyght, Ral.	Constable of Norwich Castle Itinerant Bs.	Mich. de Plumstede
481	Walesham, Rob. de Walesham, Geoff. de Bynetre, Geoff. de Bertone, Jo.	Constable of Norwich Castle S.Bs.	Will. le Chaundeler
482	Walesham, Rob. de Bateford, Rog. de Walsham, Geoff. de Bynetre, Geoff. de Urleby, Rich. de Chapeleyn, Will. le	Constable of Norwich Castle S.Bs.	Hen. de Lek . . . Jo. de Aschele Jo. Petit de Norwich
483	Waleys, ¹ Walt. le .	B.	Rob. Donel ² de Carna- done
484	Walshe, Will. .	Sub-escheator in Norfolk.	Steph. de Hepworthe
485	Waltone, Rich. de Rathesdale, Rog. de	B. of King	Will. de Knaptone

¹ Also spelt Welles.² Also spelt Doynel.

Offence	Result	Reference-membrane	County
—	—	2d, 29, 37d .	Norfolk
—	—	2d, 18 . .	Norfolk
Seizure of goods .	Losses recovered .	1d*, 5d, 8, 25d, 55, 67, 73, 75d	Norfolk
—	—	18d, 28d, 36 .	Norfolk
Illtreatment, seizure of goods	Hen., Jo., and Jo. with- drew. In M. Accused <i>sine die</i> . Mistake of name	29d, 40d, 45, 49d*, 64d, 67, 68, 77	Norfolk
Abduction of Rob.'s wife, seiz- ure of goods	—	9, 53d, 65d*, 67, 73d, 77	Cornwall
—	—	8, 28, 44 . .	Northants.
Seizure of goods .	—	15d*, 29, 34d*, 54	Lanes.

—	Name of Accused	Office	Accuser
486	Wanforde, Tho. de	—	Will. de Haleworthy
487	Welbe, Jo. le Athelwy, Will.	B. of Ruerdean . . .	Nich. le Paumer
488	Welesberghe, ¹ Ad. Wack, Philip, de Drayton	Constable of the Peace .	Jo. Paynel and wife
489	Wellawe, Anselm de	Once B. of H. of Basset- law	Rich. Goldynges .
490	Welles, Rob. de . Hugh, son of Hugh Bunsey, James de	Once B. outside east gate of Oxford	Will. le Taylour de Wodestoke
491	Westyngtone, Jo. de	B. of King . . .	Jo. Marmyon
492	Wocton, Jo. de .	Once S. of Wilts. [1281] .	Hugh le Taylour .
493	Wodeward, Will. le, de Lychefeld Bedel, Reg. le Fynch, Jo.	Bs.	Hawysia de la Beche .
494	†Wyketoft, Tho. de †Pakherneys, Ad.	B. of Parts of Holland .	Ral. de Rocheford .
495	Wymedham, Rog. de	—	Abraham Quintebrun de Brumham

¹ Also spelt Whenlesberow.

Offence	Result	Reference-membrane	County
—	—	59d . . .	Devon
—	—	41 . . .	Glouc.
Seizure of goods .	Ad. to gaol. Jo. Paynel and wife recover losses	5, 14d*, 36d .	Warwicks.
Seizure of horse .	In end, Rich. did not come. Anselm <i>sine</i> <i>die</i> and Rich. in M.	38* . . .	Notts.
Overthrow of house, seizure of furni- ture	Jury contradicted Will.'s story. Will. in M. and Rob. <i>sine die</i>	30d, 38d* . .	Oxon.
Seizure of cows etc.	Jo. de Westyngtone to gaol. 20s. fine to King. Jo. Marmyon recovers losses	16d* . . .	Glouc.
—	Hugh recovers money. Hen. of Lychefeld is <i>clericus assignatus</i>	40, 40d, 53, 66 .	Hants.
—	—	10d . . .	Staffs.
Seizure of beasts .	Ral. did not come. In M. Tho. <i>sine die</i>	1, 14, 36d, 65d*	Lines.
—	Abraham recovers money	29, 44d . . .	Norfolk

—	Name of Accused	Office	Accuser
496	†Wymn, Jo., son of Rog. de †Baylifs, Jo. le, de Edelington †Jo., son of Alex. de Nethertinc- tone †Dalderby, Alan de †Hardegrey, Will., de Horncastre †Flyer, Hen. le .	—	Alan, son of Jo. de Horbelinge
497	Wynkeburne, Walt. de	Forester in Sherwood .	Will. de Chaddeworth and wife
498	Ditto . . .	ditto . . .	Will. le Joesne de Makworth
499	Ditto . . .	—	Jo. Bigge, Rector of Stanefod
500	Wytherpyn, Ad. .	Once B. of H. of Smithdon	Rob. Alyfand . . .
501	Ditto . . .	ditto . . .	Nich. Swan de Dor- kynges
502	Ditto, and Levot, Will. de Est Rudeham	ditto . . . S.B.	Ad. de Tychewelle, ¹ clerk
503	Wytherpyn, Rob. . Gut, Gervase le .	—	Will. Walram . . .
504	Ditto, and Leuot, Will.	ditto . . .	Ad. Herlewyn, ¹ clerk .

¹ Possibly the same case.

Offence	Result	Reference-membrane	County
Illtreatment, stealing, imprisonment	Jo. le Baylif <i>sine die</i> . Proved that Alan has quitclaimed previously, so in M. Accused <i>sine die</i>	64d, 66, 75*, 76 .	Lincs.
—	Will. did not come. In M. Walt. <i>sine die</i>	5, 25* . . .	Notts.
—	—	5 . . .	Notts.
—	—	28d . . .	Notts.
Non - payment of debt, seizure of beasts	—	15d* . . .	Norfolk
Seizure of horse, imprisonment	—	22* . . .	Norfolk
Unjust imprisonment, non-execution of orders	—	7*, 18d . . .	Norfolk
—	Will. did not come. In M. Accused <i>sine die</i>	18, 37* . . .	Norfolk
Unjust amercement, imprisonment	Leuot <i>sine die</i> . Jury supports Wytherpyn	42*, 44, 52d* .	Norfolk

APPENDIX III

Note.—The following abbreviations are used : S. = sberiff. B. = bailiff.

—	Accused	Office	Accuser
1	Annesley, Jo. . . .	S. of Notts. and Derby [1285]	Jo. de Heryz
2	Attewelle, Alan, de Grafton . Porter, Will. le Brangweyn, Ad.	Bs. of the King in Warwick	Felicia, who was the wife Tho. Russel de Alyncestre
3	Aynesham, Hen. de . . .	B. of Bullingdon . .	Tho. of Oxford, and Alice wife
4	Bannebiri, Rog. de . . .	Hundredman . . .	Agnes Canoun de Tadmerton
5	Ditto	—	Rob. Justices de Bannebiri
6	Baynard, Rob. Pygot, Jo.	—	Rog. de Benhale
7	Belencombe, Jo. de . . .	B. in Suffolk . . .	Will. de Brekedis, parson church of Pettehaghe

ANALYSIS OF ROLL 541 B.

S.S. = under-sheriff.

S.B. = under-bailiff.

In M. = in misericordia.

Offence	Details	Result	Reference- membrane	County
ing to warn Jo., in a tain suit, of day and ce	—	Jo. de Heryz is to recover his losses	38, 42, <i>and</i> <i>A, 69d*, 75d</i>	Notts.
—	—	Felicia withdrew, after several adjournments	37, 37d, 38, 42d, 43, <i>and</i> <i>A, 67, 73,</i> <i>74d</i> (under Grafton)	Warwicks.
—	—	—	38d, <i>and A,</i> <i>74, 77</i>	Oxon.
ure, stealing of writs	—	Rog. to gaol, Agnes to re- cover her losses	37, 38, 42, <i>and A, 23,</i> <i>37, 77</i>	Oxon.
risenment . . .	—	—	38 <i>and A,</i> <i>22*, 75d</i>	Oxon.
—	—	—	33d . . .	Suffolk
ure of a horse . . .	—	Jury confirms complaint. Jo. amerced	40d*, <i>and A,</i> <i>28, 45, 49*,</i> <i>64, 68</i>	Essex

—	Accused	Office	Accuser
8	Berners, Rich. de . . .	Keeper of the gaol, Bristol	Rob., son of Gilb. le Espice Bristol
9	Bigod, Rog. . . .	Earl of Norfolk	Geoff. Attewatere . . .
10	Binygtone, Rich. de . .	—	Rich., son of Everard . .
11	Bisshopesgate, Ad. de . . Holt, Jo. de Salomone, ¹ Benedict Gildeforde, ² Rob. de	King's Bs. . . .	Pet. of Arundel . . .
12	Bost, Walt. Bost, Tho. Dadintone, Jo. de Milton, Rob. de	Bs.	Walt. le Harpour de Malme and Alice his wife
13	Botard, Jo.	King's B. of Bassetlaw	Ad. de Deneby

¹ Also spelt Saleman.² Also spelt Geldeforde, Guldeforde.

Offence	Details	Result	Reference- membrane	County
—	—	—	37, 38d, 42, 44d, 45, and A, 38d*, 60d, 72, 74d (under Mare)	Gloucs.
—	—	—	23 . .	Norfolk
re of a horse . .	Adjournment. . .	—	39d, and A, 8d, 21d*, 41d, 55d, 60, 67, 77 (under Thorne- thorpe)	Yorks.
re and imprison- nt	Jo. says he has been quitclaimed of same offence. Proved. Ac- cusation therefore withdrawn. Accu- sation not pursued against rest	Claim not pur- sued. Accused <i>sine die</i> . Pet. in M.	37*, 40d, 43d, 44*, 45, 45d	Kent
king into house, im- soning Alice, pre- enting repairs, cutting wn trees. Several prisonments, 1287- 91	Respite. Before Pet. de Leicester at Milton, Bost etc. gave an ex- planation	Walt. and Alice recovered losses against Walt. Bost. Tho. and Jo. were guilt- less, <i>sine die</i> . Walt. and Alice in M.	39*, 39d, 42d	Oxon.
atment . . .	Adjournment . . .	—	38d, and A, 41, 54d, 62d*, 69, 73, 77	Notts.

—	Accused	Office	Accuser
14	Boyland, ¹ Rich. de, and Leicester, Rog. de	Justice . . . ditto	Geoff. de Burdeleys .
15 ²	Boyland, Rich. de, and Roffa, Solomon de	ditto . . . ditto	Rich. Maille ³ . . .
16	Ditto	ditto	Reyner. Dernele . Elewysia Dernele . . .

¹ Also spelt Boylaunde, Boilonde, Boilaunde, Boylund, Boylonde.² Proceedings printed in Select Case No. 3.³ Also spelt Malle, Maylle, Mayle, Malye, Malie.

Offence	Details	Result	Reference- membrane	County
and late enrolments	Many adjournments. Rich. said he could not answer without Rog. Further adjournments	—	3, 5d*, 7, 7d*, 12d, 24d, 23*, 36	Cambs. Norfolk.
Roffa delayed execu- n of writs for gifts. nded one writ on to h. de Boyland, who ilarly delayed. Rich. ille was imprisoned his wife paid 40s.	Rich. de Boyland said Maille impleaded the Prior of Sheldham, who produced an agreement which pre- vented the case pro- ceeding. Adjourn- ments. Rich. Maille renounced his claim and asked to be ad- mitted to plead afresh	Case begun <i>de novo</i>	10*, 22d*	Norfolk.
e accusations, with erence to one writ e mahemio'	Rich. de Boyland said delay was through Maille's own negli- gence. Adjournments, till jury actually in Norwich at time of original case, came before Will. de Gisel- ham and Hen. de Cressingham	Rich. de Boyland <i>sine die</i> . Maille in M.		
re and imprison- nt till Reyner. paid oney to Reg. de Whit- ntel, who had bribed yland	—	Rich. de Boyland <i>sine die</i> . Rey- ner. in M.	34* . .	Cambs.
e	Rich. said he could not answer without Tho. de Sudyngtone and Walt. de Hoptone	—	34* . .	Cambs.

—	Accused	Office	Accuser
17 ¹	Boyland, Rich. de . . .	Justice . . .	Will. de Derneforde .
18	Ditto	ditto	Pet. de Waytensham .
19	Boyville, Tho. de . . . Beckebiri, Jo. de . . .	[S. of Warwicks. Mis- take for Wil. Boy- ville?] [1288] S.S. of Warwicks. .	Fulk de Lucy . . .
20	Bray, Hen. de. Haukesdone, Steph. de . . .	Escheator . . . Sub-escheator	Tho. de Skerninge, archde of Norfolk
21 ²	Ditto	ditto	Alice, daughter and heir Hugh de Brodewyndelesco

¹ Proceedings printed in Select Case No. 2.² Proceedings printed in Select Case No. 4.

Offence	Details	Result	Reference- membrane	County
<p>between Will. and de Rede, Rich. :— 1) Would not allow Will.'s exceptions. 2) By threats forced Will. to make a fine of £200 with the Earl of Glou- cester</p>	—	<p>As to (1), Will. in M. and Rich. <i>sine die</i>. (2) No final en- try</p>	<p>1d, 2, 3, 4, 5d, 7, 24, 25d*, 26, 33d</p>	Glouc.
—	—	<p>Pet. did not appear, so in M. Rich. <i>sine die</i></p>	4, 12d, 29d	Norfolk
<p>of property, break- into house</p>	<p>Tho. said Fulk was in debt to the King— hence goods seized</p>	<p>To be inquiry <i>nisi</i> <i>prius</i> etc.</p>	41* . .	Warwicks.
<p>on from land on ext that it belonged he King. Assign- t of dower out of s held by Tho.</p>	<p>Hen. said (a) he had orders from the Chan- cery; (b) injury was done before King's departure, so he need not answer. Adjourn- ments</p>	<p>Inquiry, before Will. de Gisel- ham and Hugh deCressingham</p>	<p>3d, 4d, 7, 23d*, 24</p>	Suffolk
<p>Alice was a ward he King, Bray gave anor, to which she heir, to a relative is own. he himself took a rch to which the g should have pre- ed</p>	<p>Hen. said the manor was given after due in- quiry: and he was pre- sented to the church two years before a writ forbade him to inter- fere with her lands</p>	—	14d* . .	Hants.

—	Accused	Office	Accuser
22	Bremleschote, ¹ Will. . . . Ken, Will. le Weyte, Jo. le	S. of Hants [1285] Bs.	Alan Plukenet ² . . .
23	Bret, Ad. le	B. of H. of Williton .	Jo. Aleyn and Flemilda his
24	Bretone, Jo. le	Once Keeper of London	Ral. de Honylane . . .
25	Bristol, Mayor and bailiffs of .	—	Elias, son of Will. of Bristo
26	Brompton, Will. de	Justice	1. Nigel de Ancotes . . .
27	Ditto	ditto	2. Walt., son of Ranu. Habington
28	Ditto	ditto	3. Regin. de Tyreshesse, E his wife
29	Ditto	ditto	4. Humph. de Veylly, Luc wife
30	Ditto	ditto	5. Jo. de Walkingham .
31	Ditto	ditto	6. Ral. de Leukenore .

¹ Also spelt Bremeschote, Bremleschete, Bremleshete.² Also spelt Plogeneth.

Offence	Details	Result	Reference- membrane	County
ure of beasts . .	—	Alan recovered his losses	23, 37, 37d, 42, 44d, 45, and A, 40d, 55, 61d*, 64, 73, 74d	Hants.
ure and robbery .	—	Charge with- drawn	38, 42d, and A, 65*, 73d, 74d	Somerset
bought a disc of ver. Jo. accused him acquiring it unlaw- ly, and imprisoned n	Londoners claimed that the case should be heard within the four walls of the city	Summoned at the Guildhall	10d, 30* .	London
ng Elias to retract omplaint: promising Os. in return, but ying only 40s.	Accused said the offence was after the King's return. Elias could not deny this	Accused <i>sine die</i> and Elias in M.	38d* . .	Glouc.
—	—	Complainant did not come. In M. Will. <i>sine die</i>	35d* . .	Yorks.
—	—	ditto	35d* . .	Cambs.
—	—	ditto	35d* . .	Sussex
—	—	ditto	35d* . .	Yorks.
—	—	ditto	35d* . .	Yorks.
—	—	ditto	35d* . .	Northants.

—	Accused	Office	Accuser
32	Brompton, Will. de . . .	Justice . . .	7. Ral., son of Roger . .
33	Ditto	ditto	8. Tho. de Mares, Joan wife
34	Ditto	ditto	9. Jo. de Tyteleshale . .
35	Ditto	ditto	10. Jo., son of Thomas Goldyngtone
36	Ditto	ditto	11. Walt. Surdenal . . .
37	Ditto	ditto	12. Jo. de Brydes, Alice his
38	Ditto	ditto	13. Jo. de la Wade . . .

Offence	Details	Result	Reference-membrane	County
—	—	ditto	35d* . .	—
—	—	ditto	35d* . .	—
—	—	ditto	35d* . .	Norfolk
uring Jo.'s adversary by adjourning an oin after adversary d made default. Per- s named in the writ d; debts could not recovered	Rolls sent for . .	Cancelling default was decided to have been a mistake of the justices. To be resummoned in the same state as in June 1287	32d* . .	Westmore- land
ing Walt's chal- ge of jurors in cer- n suit, who were ants of his opponent. alt. lost his suit and ds in consequence	Will. said he could not answer without his col- leagues and rolls	Illegible	36d* . .	Lines.
ns of Jo. had been ed for not coming to w of frankpledge. nce a suit, in which said no one hold- y the hundred had a ht to view of frank- edge over their ten- ts. Will. de Brompton uld not admit this swer, and Jo. and ice were fined	—	—	10d* . .	Norfolk
—	—	—	4 . .	Oxon.

—	Accused	Office	Accuser
39	Brompton, Will. de . . .	Justice . . .	14. Sim. Choket de Weseha
40	Ditto	ditto	15. Hugh de Gosebeke . .
41 ¹	Ditto	ditto	16. Abbot of Roche . . .

¹ Proceedings printed in Select Case No. 1.

Offence	Details	Result	Reference- membrane	County
case of novel dissei- Sim.) Did not give judg- ment on the day fixed) When writ came from the King, still delayed	Will. said he dared not give judgment because of Hen. de Bray, Sim.'s adversary. Bray pro- duced a letter of the King's bidding him take Sim.'s land	Day given at Hilary before King's council	6d* . .	Norfolk
—	Various orders to sheriff, and excuses as to non- production of money due	Hugh recovered money	5, 10d, 12, 23, 24d, 33	Suffolk
aynel, maintained by Kirkby, a relative Will. de Brompton, ought a writ of <i>pre-</i> <i>e</i> against Walt., ab- of Roche (predeces- of the complainant) ays were given too requently efault was enrolled against the abbot fter he had died nements were seized nto King's hands, nd abbot was sum- oned. Monks of Roche and Beaulieu estified his death, ut the justices ad- dged seisin without quiry. Thus 'error, avour and main- enance'	Will. de Brompton said:— 1. He could not answer without Hengham and his colleagues, who had confirmed his judgment 2. Justices give days more frequently than three times a year, if the county is near 3. Testimony by letters of a bishop or abbot is not admissible in the King's court 4. Inquest was taken as to abbot's death, and it was concluded that the abbot was alive at the date in ques- tion Record was called. In- quiry found to have been duly made	Abbot in M. for false claim	18* . .	Lincs.

—	Accused	Office	Accuser
42	Brompton, Will. de, and all justices of Common Pleas	Justice . . .	17. Agatha de Newcastle
43	Ditto	ditto	18. Rob. Baynarde . . .
44	Ditto	ditto	19. Rich. Goldynges Will. de la Danne . . .
45	Ditto	ditto	20. Jo. de Derneforde . . .
46	Ditto	ditto	21. Jo. de London and Walt. de la Mare (Executors of Ral. le Ma chal)
47	Ditto and Stratforde, abbot of	ditto	22. The King

Offence	Details	Result	Reference- membrane	County
Refusal to give judgment, bribes. Changing forms of pleadings	Record sent for. Found that judgment had been given against Agatha	—	35* . .	Northants.
Refusal to size of novel dissei- ment, Brompton favoured Rob.'s opponent by not allowing <i>excep- tiones</i> forcing the jury to alter their statement, which was in support of Rob. throwing away proof when Rob. brought it, and ordering Rob.'s imprisonment	No judgment enrolled in the case	Will. went quit, and Rob. in M., 'et querat alibi si viderit expe- dire'	14d* . .	Norfolk
—	Repeated orders and ex- cuses for non-produc- tion of money	Rich. and Will. were to recover money	1, 1d, 4 . .	Cambs.
—	—	Jo., complainant, did not come. In M. Will. <i>sine die</i>	35d* . .	Wilts.
Refusal of executors from sement, and, on com- plaint of executors, hin- drance of suit when day given. Thus main- durance against the custom of the city	Brompton put himself upon the record of the keeper of the city	—	34d* . .	London
—	Abbot did not come Adjournment . . .	—	23, 35 . .	Beds.

—	Accused	Office	Accuser
48	Brompton, Will. de . . .	Justice	23. Rob. de Botyndone . .
49	Ditto	ditto	24. Rob. le Paumer de K tone Rob., son of Jo. Theob. de Brokhele Godf. de Chelvestone Rob. Puttoke Hugh le Keu Bassilla Attebrigge Harwelinus de Kedyton Will. Iryke Alice Theobald
50	Ditto	ditto	25. Jo. le Bret
51	Ditto	ditto	26. Hub. Hakine Sarre de Bray Margaret de Ware
52 ¹	Ditto	ditto	27. Rog. de Thornton . .
53 ²	Ditto and Saham, Will. de . . . Hengham, Ral. de . . .	ditto ditto	28. Hen. de la Leghe . . Nich. de Cernes

¹ Proceedings printed in Select Case No. 5.² Proceedings printed in Select Case No. 8.

Offence	Details	Result	Reference- membrane	County
ing entry of essoin, judging default, in certain case. Rob. ore he saw the essoin tered. Will. im-soned him	Rob. was asked whether he would verify his statements by clerks and attorneys. He would not, though willing to do so by a 'patria' of Northampton	Rob. in M. . .	33d* . . .	Northants.
ys and false enrol-ents, by which com-ainants lost seisin	Record examined . .	Complainants to be restored to same seisin as at time of judg-ment	36d* . . .	Suffolk
—	—	—	4d . . .	Hunts.
—	—	—	32 . . .	—
tenance of Hugh, sen Hen.; illegal conduct case	(Too lengthy to include in table)	—	1, 1d, 2, 3, 4, 9*, 12d, 24, 33d	Cambs.
tenance of Will. de mesforde; unjust imprisonment	(Too lengthy to include)	Hengham to gaol, fined. Brompton <i>sine die</i>	3, 4, 5d, 7d, 8d, 15*, 16*, 16d*, 23, 24d, 32	Beds.

—	Accused	Office	Accuser
54	Bruges, Rog. de . . .	Clerk of Tho. de Weyland	Rob. de Bromwyz . . .
55	Bryan, Jo. . . .	—	Rob. de la Sale . . .
56	Bungay, ¹ Geoff. de . .	B. of Norwich .	Sim. de Skernyngges, clerk
57	Ditto, and Blekestre, Jo. le Bertone, Jo. de	Bs. of Norwich .	Jo. de Ronhale, chaplain .
58	Burne, Hen. de . . .	Clerk to Roger de Inkepenne	Rich. Batecocke . . .
59	Burwardesleye, Nich. de . Rochale, Reg. de . . . Body, Rich.	Constable of Bridg- north B.	Will. Hamme, parson of Amp Lovet
60	Cave, Jo. de	Clerk to Ralph de Hengham	1. Frater Gilb. de S. August 'preceptor' of Slebecche

¹ Also spelt Bunggeys.

Offence	Details	Result	Reference- membrane	County
de Bruges and Nich. Rollestone seized ob.'s goods after he had had the church of arneby for three years	Adjournments . .	—	3, 7d, 10d, 12d, 23, 24d, 29d, 33, 43*	Notts. Yorks.
—	Adjournments . .	—	3, 4, 7, 24d .	Herts.
—	Adjournment . .	—	28 . .	Norfolk
an inquiry before eoff. and Jo., Jo. re- moved 3 men and sub- stituted 3 others. Thus o. de Ronhale lost his se. Utensils in the house were adjudged his opponents	As to seisin, Jo. de Ron- hale could only have remedy by common law	—	38*, 42, and A, 4d*, 18, 25, 36	Norfolk
—	Adjournments . .	Rich. recovered money	37, 37d, 39d, 44, 45, 46, and A, 36d, 56d (under Inkepenne)	Wilts. Hants.
ure of goods . .	Adjournments . .	—	38, 42, 45, and A, 58d, 61d*, 67d, 73, 75d	Salop
aring his own presen- tion to a church, con- ary to statute	Jo. said he was not in the King's service, or Hengham's service, at the time. He was in the service of the Abbot of Fécamp, 'tanquam alius privatus'	Jo. de Cave to the Tower. Fine of 10 marks	31* . .	Warwicks.

—	Accused	Office	Accuser
61	Cave, Jo. de	Clerk to Ralph de Hengham	2. Tho. de Somerton, and A his wife
62 ¹	Ditto	ditto	3. Will. de Saham
63	Ditto	ditto	Margery de Gunedale . . .
64 ²	Certeseye, ³ Jo. de	Once clerk to Will. de Brompton	Jo. de Rede, son of Rog. de E

¹ Proceedings printed in Select Case No. 8a.² Proceedings printed in Select Case No. 6.³ Also spelt Chartseie.

Offence	Details	Result	Reference- membrane	County
had been robbed of various property, but especially books (decrees, code, and digest). Jo. de Cave, from favour, did not mention the books in his record of the case	Jo. de Cave said he was not sitting as clerk of Bench at the time	Gilbert of Thornton to hold inquiry over again	29* . .	Oxon.
Hen Will. de Saham and Ral. de Hengham were colleagues, Jo. de Cave altered date, in case of Hen. de la Leghe and Nich. de Cernes v. V. de Temesforde. Saham would not allow Hen. and Nich. challenges, not knowing that Will. de Brompton was favouring their adversary	—	Saham withdrew the charge. Accused <i>sine die</i>	21* . .	Beds.
—	—	—	33 . .	Norfolk
under age, Jo. handed over tenements to Jo. de Certeseye and Nich. de Certeseye. They had a fine made at Westminster 'absque examinacione et absque brevi et absque summonicione et absque ordine curie'	Jo. said he did not know whether the fine was enrolled, for Jo. de Certeseye was then a clerk of the Bench	—	3d*, 4, 24d .	Suffolk and Middlesex

—	Accused	Office	Accuser
65 ¹	Cestria, Jo. de	Clerk to Ralph de Hengham	Hen. le Keu and Agnes wife
66	Chaddeworthe, Rob. de . . Clerke, Will. le Surdayle, Rog.	Once S. of Lincs. [1285, 1287]	Denis Abraham, and others
67	Chamber, Jo. de la . . .	—	Jo. de Longespeye . . .
68	Chyryntone, Will. de . .	—	Edm. de Mortimer . . .
69	Clifton, Gerv. Wylforde de .	Once S. of Yorks. [1285]	Prior of Holy Trinity, York
70	Ditto	—	Amandus de Ruda . . .
71	Ditto, and Broghtone, Rich. de Petenyn, Will. Ras, Will. de Gyseley Botter, Will. Suttone, Tho. de Sulni, Alured de Roderham, Rich. de	ditto	Ingram Folensaunt, Ingr his son

¹ Proceedings printed in Select Case No. 7.

Offence	Details	Result	Reference- membrane	County
tenance of Hen.'s l Agnes' adversaries. proper conduct of e. Beating and as- lt upon Agnes	Jury confirmed John's defence	Jo. de Cestria ac- quitted, and complainants in mercy	5* . .	London
re of goods belong- to Denis and other rchants	—	Accusers did not come. Accused <i>sine die</i>	42d, 44, 44d*	Lincs.
—	—	Accusations with- drawn. Ac- cused <i>sine die</i> . Accusers in M.	37d, 38, 42*	North- umberland
—	—	At request of complainant, re- mitted to com- mon law	33* . .	Northants
—	—	Prior recovered money	3, 4, 12d, 33	Notts.
ce, imprisonment, ction of money	—	As to imprison- ment, already a suit, so Ger- vase <i>sine die</i>	37d, 38, 42, <i>and A, 11*,</i> <i>39d, 56d,</i> <i>71, 74d, 76</i>	Yorks.
sonment and seizure oods	—	—	41d, <i>and A,</i> <i>2d, 36d, 53,</i> <i>56d, 64,</i> <i>66d, 76d*</i>	Yorks.

—	Accused	Office	Accuser
72	Clyve, Walt. de la . . . Cras Eylof, Rog. le Honyngtone, Jo. de Londres, Jo. de	B. of Melksham . . .	Sim. de Paulesholte and c
73	Cobham, Jo. de . . .	Justice . . .	Hugh le Taillour . . .
74	Colle, Rob. . . . Hiclynges, Jo. de Nottingham, Sim. de	Bs. of Staffs. . .	Avice le Gaunter . . .
75	Colle, Rob. . . . Billawe, Will. de	ditto . . .	Hugh de Wodeforde, vic St. Werbergh
76	Croteman, Hen. . . . Bunggeys, Geoff. Sumter, Reg. le Olegon, Jo.	Once S.S. of Norfolk	Jo. de Ronhale, chaplain
77	Croteman, Hen. . . .	ditto . . .	Mariota de Immer . .
78	Dallynges, Rich. de . .	B. of H. of Holt . .	Barth. de Benevile, pars Wivetone
79	Don, Jo. . . .	Once S.B. of the King	Tho. de Wyntone and his wife

Offence	Details	Result	Reference- membrane	County
Seizure of goods, imprisonment	—	Walt., Jo. and Jo. not ministri: so <i>sine die</i>	38, and A, 11*, 36d, 54d, 59d, 67, 72, 76	Wilts.
Seizure of sheep Pet. of Eldenham at Jo.'s command made hamsokne, took Hugh's goods, im- prisoned his wife and children	—	—	3, 4d*, 8d	Kent
—	—	Avice, complain- ant, did not come. Accused <i>sine die</i>	37d, 38d, 42, 42d*, 44, 45	Notts.
—	—	Hugh did not come. Accused <i>sine die</i>	38d, 42d*	Notts.
Proceeding against Jo. in court Christian while case before King im- pending: hence Jo. was excommunicated and imprisoned	—	To be inquiry in May wherever the King is in Norfolk	38, 42, and A, 45, 49d*	Norfolk
Issuing writ, imprisoning Mariota, then releasing her on his own authority	—	—	37d, 40d, 44, 45d*	Norfolk
Seizure of a horse.	—	Jury supported defendant. Rich. <i>sine die</i> and Barth. in M.	38, 43, and A, 58d, 75*, 76	Norfolk
—	—	—	42d	Hants.

—	Accused	Office	Accuser
80	Fenstrete, Tho. de . . . Seblame, Jo. Ingholf, Jo.	King's Bs. in Cambs.	Tho. de Excestre and Alic wife
81	Forester, Will. le . . .	B. of Ospringe .	Katharine de la Ryole .
82	Fraunceys, Steph. le . . . Skot, Will. Risseby, Jo. de Fraunceys, Will. le	Bs. in Holderness .	Odelina de Skypse .
83	Fraunceys, Will. le . . . Fraunceys, Steph. le Risseby, Jo. de Duke, Ral. Attehenges, Tho. Rob., son of Pet. Ingram, Steph. Hull, Steph. de	Bs. . . .	Emma de Skipese .
84	Fraunceys, Steph. . . . Risseby, Jo. de Laurence, Will. son of Suthorne, Rich. le Laske, Will. Fraunceys, Will. le	Bs. . . .	Emma de Skipese .

Offence	Details	Result	Reference- membrane	County
Seizure and imprisonment	Roll A. includes 18 other names: defence there is that case has already been tried elsewhere	—	43d, and A, 30, 37d, 45d, 49d* (under David)	Cambs.
Robbery	Robbery committed while the King was in England	Special justices given to Katharine	23*, 35	Kent
Seizure, robbery, imprisonment. False indictment for theft. Exclusion from her house on release.	—	Jury declared Odelina was seized because she was indicted for theft: Will. le Fraunceys had maliciously procured the indictment. She was not excluded from her house	2, 37, 38d, 39d*, 43, 43d, 44, 45, and A, 76	Yorks.
Seizure of goods, imprisonment	Defence is that she was indicted for theft	Steph., son of Will., was not concerned. Rest committed to gaol. Emma to recover losses	44, and A, 20d, 34*, 36, 53, 68, 74, 76	Yorks.
Emma imparked an ox. Will. le Fraunceys declared she had stolen it, shut her in her house and seized the ox. When she got a writ against him, he again seized her	—	—	37, 38d*, 39d*, 43d, 44, 44d, 45	Yorks.

—	Accused	Office	Accuser
85	Frestone, Alan le	Archdeacon of Norfolk	Reg. de Watredene
86	Gerarde, Hen., de Gildeforde	Clerk to Jo. de Luvetot	Hen. le Carpenter
87	Ditto	ditto	Jo. de Staundone
88	Gilward, Hen. Hogge, Tho. Wolryke, Rog.	—	Jo. de Houtone
89	Glovere, Jo.	—	Werwella Hathewy
90	Grapynel, Hen.	S. of Herts.	Alice atte Hevyhath
91	Hallesworthy, Will. de	Parson of church of Lanhern	Will. Devenays
92	Hamounde, Rob. de	Once B. of Scarborough	Jo. de Crauncewyco

Offence	Details	Result	Reference- membrane	County
lan, collecting arrears of the fifteenth in the archidiaconate of Norwich, represented Reg. as excommunicate, and had him imprisoned	Records proved that the case had already been tried	Reg. in M. . .	25*, 26, 34, 35	Norfolk
—	Repeated orders to the sheriff to pay money to Hen.	Hen. le Carpenter recovered money against Gerarde	3, 4, 12d, 24	Middlesex
—	ditto	Jo. recovered money against Hen.	4, 12d . . .	Surrey
—	—	—	40d, and A, 73d, 77d	Norfolk
bbing Werwella of 25d. and a hood, and breaking two King's writs	—	As to the theft, Werwella recovered her losses. In second charge, failed to appear	42d, 44d, 45*, and A, 45, 53d, 59, 69*, 76d	Hereford
—	—	—	37, 43d, 44 .	Essex
ing Will. Devenays to the deception of the King's court	—	—	38, and A, 75d	Devon
—	—	—	38d, and A, 53, 64, 67d, 73, 77	Yorks.

—	Accused	Office	Accuser
93	Haythe, Pet. de . . .	S.B. of H. of Gallow	Mich. de Plumstede . .
94 ¹	Hengham, Ral. de . . .	Chief justice of King's Bench	Will. de Berdewelle . .
95 ²	Ditto	ditto	Will. de Kanvile, merchant Bristol
96	Ditto	ditto	Rich. de Langeforde . .
97	Ditto	ditto	Walt. Maudut, for self others
98	Ditto	ditto	Rog. Payteuayne

¹ Proceedings printed in Select Case No. 10.² Proceedings printed in Select Case No. 9.

Offence	Details	Result	Reference- membrane	County
—	—	Mich. did not come. Pet. <i>sine die</i> and Mich. in M.	42 . .	Norfolk
Favour and maintenance of abbot of St. Edmund's in his case against Will.	—	—	6* . .	Suffolk
Refusal to hear case	Hengham produced a writ from the King bidding him leave the case to be tried in Ireland	Hengham acquitted. Will. in M.	14* . .	Ireland
In case where Rich. and others were acquitted, Hengham should have imprisoned their adversary and made their losses good. He neglected to do so, by favour to the bishop of Exeter. False enrolments	Records prove that Rich. was not injured	Rich. in M.	1, 1d, 3, 3d, 7d, 22d*	Devon
Walt. and others were manucaptors in a certain case. Then a fresh set of manucaptors. Hengham imprisoned the first set when accused was not produced	Rolls sent for. Hengham pleaded an alibi	Hengham <i>sine die</i> . Rich. in M. 'quia dedixit recordum'	21d* . .	—
Delay and false judgment	Rolls prove Rog. had no injury	Defence proved true	10, 22*, 32, 38d	Lincs.

—	Accused	Office	Accuser
99	Hengham, Ral. de	Chief justice of King's Bench	Tho. de Seggesfelde ¹ .
100	Ditto	ditto	Rich. de Whitacre . James de Asteleye Philippa his wife
101	Ditto	ditto	Anketinus de Wodecote . Matilda his wife Geoff. Pytenryche
102	Hugh, son of Hen.	—	Rog. de Thorntone . .
103	Inkepenne, Rog. de	S. of Cornwall [1285, 1286, 1302]	Mark de Trewalder . .
104	Ditto	ditto	Will. de Coudray . .
105	Ditto, with Walingforde, Alan de	ditto	Rich. de Trevaga . .

¹ Also spelt Sechefeld, Seggesfeld, Seggesfeud, Segesfeld.

Offence	Details	Result	Reference- membrane	County
Will. de Ewelle, canon of St. Paul's, brought an assize of novel disseisin against Tho. as to a garden in suburb of London, at instance of Hengham. Hengham conducted the assize unfairly	Rolls bore out Hengham's account. Tho. said Hengham made the record a year after his deposition from office	Tho. in M. for false claim	1, 1d, 3, 4d, 25*	Middlesex
False judgment, contrary to records	—	Not within the scope of auditors' commission	27* . .	Warwicks.
Inquest taken unfairly . Unjust ejection	Hengham appealed to the writ	—	34* . .	Hants.
—	—	—	1d . .	Cambs.
Making Mark withdraw from a case on condition of a certain payment, which was never made	Rog. admitted the debt, had paid part, and would pay the rest	Quitclaimed	38, 40d*, and A, 64, 67, 73d	Cornwall
—	—	—	38d, and A, 67, 74d	Berks.
Imprisonment . . .	—	—	37, 39d, 43d, 44d, 46, and A, 8, 63d, 72d, 74, 76, 77d	Cornwall

—	Accused	Office	Accuser
106	John Blober, Sim. ² Mouner, Rich. le ³ Sabindone, Will de Ewe, Nich. del Lounge, Reg. le Grymelinges, Reg. de ⁴ Hurele, Reg. Lumingge, Alex. de ⁵ Stapele, Rich. de Sabindone, Jo. de Carrer, Will. le	B. of the Archbishop of Canterbury in H. of Petham Late Bs. of Canter- bury	Edw. de Kenefeude ¹
107	Kempe, Geoff.	Once keeper of Ips- wich	Rich. Neuman
108	Kyuile, Jo. ⁶ Beaumer, Rob. de	—	Will. de Kelesey
109	Leicester, Rog. de	Justice	Hugh de Gosebeke
110 ⁷	Lincoln, Rog. de	Constable of Exeter Castle	Tho. Silvester
111	Luvetot, Jo. de	Justice	Hugh de Gosbeke

¹ Also spelt Kanefelde.⁴ Also spelt Grimmygges.⁶ Also spelt Keyvile.² Also spelt Blowere.³ Also spelt Mounghner.⁵ Also spelt Limingge, Lymyng.⁷ Proceedings printed in Select Case No. 11.

Offence	Details	Result	Reference- membrane	County
—	—	Accusation with- drawn. Accused <i>sine die</i>	37, 37d*, 44, 40d, 44d, 45, and A, 57, 60d, 66 (under Chilton)	Kent
—	—	—	40d, 43d	Norfolk
Illtreatment . . .	—	—	38d, 39d, 43d, and A, 53d, 62*, 71, 74	Yorks.
—	—	Hugh recovered money against Rog.	5, 7, 10, 12, 24d, 33, 36	Cambs.
Illtreatment, imprison- ment, seizure of goods	Rog. was declared a bai- liff of the King, and Tho. was imprisoned for arrears due	—	40* . .	Devon
—	—	Hugh recovered money against Jo.	10d, 12, 24d, 33	Suffolk

	Accused	Office	Accuser
112 ¹	Luvetot, Jo. de	Justice	Jo., son of Hub. de Herelawe
113	Ditto	ditto	Jo. de Pykerynges and twenty four others
114	Ditto	ditto	Jo. de Pikeringes
115	Ditto	ditto	Rich., son of Jo. de Kissere
116 ²	Ditto	ditto	Tho., Prior of St. Mary de But teley
117	Lyttelbiri, Rob. de Bradeforde, Jo. de	Justices	Elias, son of Will. de Bristolle
118	Martlisham, Rog. de Ralph	B. S.B.	Jo. Clerbaud, parson of Sulbry
119	Matt., son of Jo. Poulesholt, Rich. Lincoln, Rog. de Chichester, Jo. de	S. of Devon [1287] Constable of Devon	Will. Derwyn

¹ Proceedings printed in Select Case No. 12.² Proceedings printed in Select Case No. 13.

Offence	Details	Result	Reference- membrane	County
Jo. de Luvetot with his clerk, Hen. de Gildeforde, concealed murder, helped Jo.'s adversaries, and prevented Jo. from answering	Story found true . .	Hen. de Gildeforde sent to the Tower. Jo., son of Hub., recovered losses	28*, 28d* .	Essex
Unfair conduct of case . .	—	Complainants did not come. In M. Jo. de Luvetot <i>sine die</i>	35* . .	Norfolk
Unjust imprisonment and fine	Jo. de Pikeringes did not come	Luvetot <i>sine die</i> . Jo. de Pikeringes in M.	1, 1d, 3, 5*, 8*, 24, 45d	ditto
Unjust inquiry, seisin wrongfully given	—	—	11d* . .	London
False enrolments . .	—	Assize to be re-examined. Record sent for by King	11, 20*, 20d*	Norfolk
—	—	Complainant did not come; in M.	40d* . .	Glouc.
Seizure of grain on pretext of King's fifteenth	—	Jo. recovered losses	42, and A, 18, 26d*, 45d, 53, 56d, 59d, 60, 68	Suffolk
—	—		3, 3d, 6, 23, 24, 29, 33	Devon

	Accused	Office	Accuser
120	Matt., son of Jo. . . . Lincoln, Rog. de . . . Chapele, Rog. de la . .	S. . . . Constable	Jo. of Exeter . . .
121	Matt., son of Jo. . . .	S. . . .	Rog. de Arderne . . .
122	Ditto	ditto	Will. Inge, <i>qui sequitur pro reg</i>
123	Maundrel, Will. . . .	—	Tho. de Leyes . . .
124	Miltone, Rob. de . . . Wrynges, Rob.	Bs. of Oxford . .	Tho. de Somerton and Alice h wife
125	Molyngtone, Pet. de . .	Sub-escheator in Essex	Will. de Boneville . . .
126	Norwich, Jo. de . . .	Clerk	Jo. de Ronhale, chaplain .

Offence	Details	Result	Reference- membrane	County
—	—	—	3, 3d, 6, 7d, 12d, 23, 24, 29	Devon
—	—	Money due from Matt. to Rog.	5, 7d . .	Devon
drance of coroners from executing orders in cases against Jo. of Exeter and Rog. of Arderne	—	They acquitted Matt., but:— (1) Rog. de Putforde to gaol. (2) Rog. de Lincoln to gaol, fined. (3) Rob. de Cruwes fined. (4) Jo. As sheleghe fined. (5) Hugh de Raleghe fined	24, 26* .	Devon
reatment, seizure of beasts	—	—	38d, and A, 56, 67d, 75d*, 76	Derbys.
bery	—	—	38d*, 42, 43d, and A, 48d, 55, 57, 60d, 75d (under Gamage)	Oxon.
—	—	—	10, 32 . .	Essex
-prosecution, through ollusion, of case in which Jo. de Norwich was attorney for Jo. e Ronhale	—	Jo. de Norwich committed to the Fleet	41d*, 45d .	London

—	Accused	Office	Accuser
127	Picheforde, Geoff. de . . .	[Constable of Windsor]	Rob. de Stauntone . . .
128	Prestede, Rich. de . . .	B. of the King . . .	Alice, who was the wife of P. le Hirde
129	Prestone, Rob. de . . . Skenholte, Hen. de	Clerks of Sol. de Rochester	Rob. de la Sale . . .
130	Pylat, Rob.	S.B. in H. of Edwins- tree	Elias the Carpenter . . .
131	Rochale, Reg. de . . . London, Jo. de	Bs. of the King . . .	Rich., son of Geoff. de P. forde
132	Rochester, Sol. de . . .	Justice . . .	Tho. de Cardoyl . . .

Offence	Details	Result	Reference- membrane	County
ction from manor	—	—	24d* .	Sussex
ing Rich. to keep a chief, who killed him. Hindrances and fining of Alice when she brought a writ <i>pro</i> <i>norte</i>	—	After several ad- journments, Alice did not come. Rich. de Prestede <i>sine</i> <i>die</i> and Alice in M.	39*, 40* .	Essex
se entries recording Rob.'s conviction for naiming, whereas he had proved that the attack was made in self-defence	Rolls examined . .	Rob. de la Sale in M. for false claim	3, 7, 24d, 30*	Berks.
eated summonings and annoyance to ex- port money. Seizure of ools. Procuring par- on of church of Wid- iall to implead Elias	—	Rob. <i>sine die</i> . Elias in M.	40d*, 42d .	Herts.
—	—	—	40d, 43d, 44, <i>and A, 56</i>	Salop
curring a counter-accu- tion against Tho. in order to prevent Tho. proceeding further against certain Yar- mouth men. Unjust conduct of the case	—	Sol. <i>sine die</i> . Tho. in M.	12* . .	Norfolk

—	Accused	Office	Accuser
133 ¹	Rochester, Sol. de . . .	Justice . . .	Hen., son of Nich. de Edmunds
134	Ditto, with Sudington, Tho. de	ditto . . .	Rob. Rose . . .
135	Ditto . . .	ditto . . .	Tho. Wynter . . .
136	Roldestone, Nich. de . . .	B. of the King in Wapentake of Newark	Jo. de Kelum . . .
137	Russele, Andr. . . .	—	Jo. Durowe . . .
138	Saham, Will. de . . .	Justice . . .	Alan Osmunde . . .
139	Ditto . . .	ditto . . .	Will., son of Will. de Br halle

¹ Proceedings printed in Select Case No. 14.

Offence	Details	Result	Reference- membrane	County
Forgery of documents to excuse Hen. of receiving felons. Imprisonment, in order to have Sol.'s protégé installed in a church which Hen. had presented elsewhere. Imprisonment of a jury which would not convict Hen. Maintenance of prior of Bromholme against Hen.	—	No collusion, injury, or transgression done, in the opinion of the Commissioners. Hen. in custody	30d* . .	Suffolk
Delay of judgment . .	—	Sol. and Tho. <i>sine die</i> , Rob. in M.	12* . .	Norfolk
Delay of judgment . .	—	—	31d* . .	Essex
—	—	—	40d, 43d .	Notts.
—	—	—	37d, 39d, 43d, 44d, 45, 46, and A, 67d, 74	Cornwall
Judging of tenement, though Alan offered to pay arrears of rent	—	—	5, 7d, 9d*, 24d	Cambs.
Just arrest, and long imprisonment	—	Will. son of Will. in M. for false claim	34d* . .	[Norfolk]

—	Accused	Office	Accuser
140	Saham, Will. de	Justice	Ral. de Dytton
141	Ditto	ditto	Jo. Nottelyn
142	Ditto	ditto	Guy de Stanham
143 ¹	Ditto	ditto	Rob., son of Sim. de Stanton
144	Sandwich, Ral. de	Keeper of the Tower.	Sim. de Paris
145 ²	Ditto Rokesle, Greg. de Banquelle, Jo. de	ditto Keeper of Exchange	Hugh le Tayllur

¹ Proceedings printed in Select Case No. 15.² Proceedings printed in Select Case No. 16.

Offence	Details	Result	Reference- membrane	County
an assize of novel disseisin. Ral. was not summoned, and had not had view of the tenement. Yet he was amerced, put on the assize and imprisoned	—	—	7, 8* . . .	Cambs.
seizure of Jo. and his goods by Saham, when justice in Gloucester	—	Jo. withdrew. Will. <i>sine die</i> , and Jo. in M.	7, 11d*, 12d, 24	Gloucs.
delay and favour. Saham gave Guy's opponents another day, when records were not produced. Saham did not appear on the day fixed	—	—	5, 7, 24, 29d*	Hants.
refusal to allow Rob. challenge of sale of land by his mad father	—	King's writ stopped case	19* . . .	Hunts.
seizure of goods of Sim. for debt to merchants of Lucca, though Sim. had gone from the Exchequer acquitted	—	Auditors had no power, as merchants were not ministers of the King	26* . . .	London
hindrance of Hugh's proof in a certain case	—	Elias de Bekingham and Will. de Gyselham appointed to try out the case within the city	31* . . .	London

—	Accused	Office	Accuser
146	Saumfforde, Tho. de . . .	—	Rich. de Maswenham Margery his wife Jo. their son
147 ¹	Segefelde, Tho. de . . .	—	Rob. Herizarde . . .
148	Serjaunt, Rob. le . . .	Once B. of the King .	Egidius de Roshale . . .
149	Skirmissour, Jo. le . . . Pyronn, Hen. Ad. Hen. Serjaunt, Jo. le . . . Kempe, Geoff.	B. to Sheriff Cellarer of ditto Prior of Wymondham Cellarer	Tho. de Honingge, vicar Besthorpe
150	Skot, Will.	—	Pet. de Mouncewes . . .
151	Stapeltone, Nich. de . . . Louthre, Hugh de . . .	—	Ad. de Haveryngtone . .
152	Stapeltone, Nich. de . . .	—	Rob. de Chiltone . . .

¹ Proceedings printed in Select Case No. 17.

Offence	Details	Result	Reference- membrane	County
—	—	—	36 . .	—
ho. called Rob. 'false clerk' and accused him of false enrolments	—	Tho. committed to gaol. Later, he made fine	44d* . .	Middlesex London
seizure of goods and beasts	—	Jury confirmed Rob.'s defence	38d and A, 30d, 32*, 41d, 54d, 55d, 59, 68, 72, 76d (under Taverner)	Notts.
seizure and imprisonment	—	Prior and cellarer <i>sine die</i> . Hen. Pyronn to gaol. Later, made fine	38, and A, 61*, 64, 66, 73, 74d*	Norfolk
—	—	—	39d . .	—
ough bribed Nich. against Ad. in an assize of novel disseisin	—	Ad. in M.	36* . .	Westmore- land
seizure of Rob.'s horses to extort payment for grain. Rob. had already paid	—	Rob. did not come. Nich. <i>sine die</i> , and Rob. in M.	30* . .	Berks.

—	Accused	Office	Accuser
153 ¹	Stapeltone, Nich. de . . .	—	Tho. de Goldington . Amice his wife
154 ²	Strattone, Ad. . . .	Baron of Exchequer	Pet. de Croppery . . .
155 ³	Ditto	ditto	Rog. Godman de Bermur deseye
156	Suttone, Gilb.	Once clerk to the S. of Cambs.	Rich. Poterel
157	Taylor, Gilb. le, and 40 more	—	Jo. Germen de Derby .
158	Todenham, Rog. de . . . Butte, Will. Woucht, Mich. de	Bs. of Norwich .	Agnes de Acre . . .
159	Vescy, Will. de	Justice of the forest	Jo. de Ferlyngetone . .

¹ Proceedings printed in Select Case No. 18.³ Proceedings printed in Select Case No. 20.² Proceedings printed in Select Case No. 19.

Offence	Details	Result	Reference- membrane	County
Inquest, after murder of Amice's brother, was taken by Nich. in Newcastle instead of in Westmoreland, and by kinsfolk of the felons	—	Action fell to the ground. Nich. produced a deed from the King	17*, 17d* .	West- moreland
After fixing a term of years for payment of a debt, Ad. suddenly claimed it. Pet. paid. Ad. then destroyed the document acknowledging his payment	—	False complaint. Pet. in M.	1, 3, 4, 13* .	Northants. Berks.
Seizure of Rog.'s horses. Declaration, when the horses were demanded, that Rog. was a fugitive villein	—	Ad. convicted and sent to gaol	11* . .	London
—	—	—	48d . .	Cambs.
—	—	Jo. did not prosecute the case. Gilb. etc. <i>sine die</i>	42d* . .	Derbys.
—	—	—	42d . .	Norfolk
Making regard of a certain wood, and taking it into King's hands	—	Record sent <i>coram rege</i>	32* . .	Yorks.

—	Accused	Office	Accuser
160	Waldeforde, Hen. de . . .	—	Jo. de Staundone . . .
161 ¹	Weylaunde, Tho. . . .	Chief justice of Common Pleas	Will. Wareyn, general attorney to the abbot of St. Evroult
162	Weyse, Walt. de . . .	B. of Worcester .	Hen. de Lychefelde, attorney for Rob. Colle
163	Wyforne, Hen. de . . . Hernenighe, Will. de	—	Hereward de la More de Bluntesdone
164	Wyketoft, Tho. de . . . Packherneys, Ad. . . .	Bs. in Wapentake of Holland	Ral. de Rocheforde . . .
165	Wymn, Jo. de . . . Wiluby, Will. de . . . Hardegrey, Will. . . . Jo. . . . Jo., son of Alex. de Nethertintone Dalderby, Alan de Flyer, Hen. le Rudde, Will. Alan, son of Rog. de Conyng- gesby	— Constable of the peace B. of Horncastle B. of Edlington	Alan, son of Jo. de Horblenge .

¹ Proceedings printed in Select Case No. 21.

Offence	Details	Result	Reference- membrane	County
—	—	Jo. recovered money	3d . .	Surrey
False judgment, full dues against abbot of Lei- cester never paid	—	—	23, 33d* .	Lancs. Leicesters.
Seizure of goods . . .	—	Rob. Colle re- covered his losses. Hen. appointed to receive the pay- ments	45, and A, 21d*, 60d (under Veyse)	Worcesters.
Seizure of goods, ejection	—	Hereward re- covered losses. Hen. rescued some of the money col- lected, by force	38d, 42, and A, 48, 56d, 66, 74d, 76	Wilts.
Seizure of beasts . . .	—	Tho. and Ad. <i>sine die</i> . Ral. did not come. In M.	38d, 42, and A, 1, 14, 36d, 65d*	Lincs.
Illtreatment and im- prisonment	—	Accused <i>sine die</i>	42d, 44, 45, and A, 64d, 66, 75*, 76	Lincs.

INDEX

NOTE.—The Index refers only to the Introduction, the Select Cases, and Appendix I. Appendices II. and III. are themselves in some sort an index, since the names of accused persons are arranged in alphabetical order. It seemed therefore unnecessary to increase the present index by several hundred entries without any great addition to its usefulness.

ABBEYS AND PRIORIES:

Babwell, Norfolk (Franciscan), 95
 Beaulieu, Hampshire (Cistercian), 2, 4
 Broomholme, Norfolk (Cluniac), 68
 Bury St. Edmunds, Suffolk (Benedictine), xl, 49–51
 Butley, Suffolk (Black Canons), 62–67
 Leicester, Leicestershire (Black Canons), 91, 92
 Lilleshall, Shropshire (Black Canons), xxvi
 Netley, Hampshire (Cistercian), 2
 Quarr, Isle of Wight (Cistercian), 96
 Roche, Yorkshire (Cistercian), xxxix, 1–5
 St. Evroult, dep. Orne (Benedictine), 91, 92
 Shouldham, Norfolk (Gilbertine), 12
 Stratford, Essex (Cistercian), 33
 Abergavenny, letter dated at, 67
 — castle, keeper of (Henry de Bray), xxxii
 Accusations, analysis of, xxxix
 — nature of the, xxxiii–xliii
 Acton Burnell, Statute of, *see* Statutes
Alba Mara, *de*, *see* Albemarle
 Albemarle, Countess of (Isabella de Fors), 51, 85, 87
 Andreu. *See* Andrew
 Andrew, Richard, 31, 45
 Apperley, Nicholas de, steward to Earl of Gloucester, 7, 10
 Appleby, Westmoreland, 81
 — Robert de, 81, 83

Aqua, Geoffrey de, xlv
 Arey, Norman de, 78, 79
 — Thomas de, 79
 Asby, Westmoreland, 82
 Askeby. *See* Asby
 Asser, John, 91
Auditores Querelarum, appointment of, Oct. 13, 1289, xii; xiv, xv; xxi–xxv
 — in city of London, xxiv, 79, 80
 BABWELL PRIORY. *See under* Abbeys and Priors
 Bakewell, John de, xxiv, 56
 — Hugh le Taylor *v.*, 78–80
 Balliol, John, xxvii
 Banbury, Roger de, hundredman, xxvi, xxvii
 Barba, Thomas cum, 31, 45
 Bardwell, Suffolk, 49, 68, 69
 — William de, chaplain, *v.* Boyland, Hengham, Lovetot, and Weyland, xl, xli, 49, 51, 70
 Barford, Bedfordshire, 28, 38
 Barking, John de, steward of Adam de Stratton, 90
 Basinghall prison. *See under* Prisons
 Bassingeshawe. *See* Basinghall
 Baude, Robert le, sheriff of Northamptonshire, 86
 Bauquelle. *See* Bakewell
 Beauchamp, James de, 78
 — Ralph de, 28, 29, 31, 32, 36, 41, 42
 Beaulieu Abbey. *See under* Abbeys and Priors

- Begeville, Thomas de, 64
 Bekingham, Elias de, justice, 21, 63, 79, 80
 Bekyngham. *See* Bekingham
 Belce. *See* Bele
 Bele, John de, 26
 Belet, William, 12, 13
 Belhus, Thomas de, sheriff of Cambridgeshire, 73, 74
Bello Campo, de, *see* Beauchamp
 Benedict, Prior of Shouldham, 12, 13, 16
 Berdeswelle, Berdewelle. *See* Bardwell
 Bereforde. *See* Barford
 — William de, *narrator* for Roger de Thornton, 20, 21
 Bergeveny. *See* Abergavenny
 Berkynge. *See* Barking
 Bermondsey, Surrey, 90
 Bermundseye. *See* Bermondsey
 Berwick-on-Tweed, letters dated at, 66, 77
 Beverley, William de, bailiff of Dublin, 46
 Biggleswade hundred, Bedfordshire, 28
 Bigod, Ralph, 58, 60, 61
 — Roger, Earl of Norfolk, xlv
 Blanmouster, John de, bailiff of sheriff of Essex, 56
 Blenes, Richard de, 31, 45
 Blont, Hugh le, 31, 45
 Blund, Hugh le, sheriff of Essex, 54, 55, 58, 60, 61
 Boilaunde, Boilonde. *See* Boyland
 Boniface VIII., Pope, xxxvii
 Botyndone, Robert de, xlii
 Boyland, Richard de, justice: William de Bardwell v., 49, 51
 — William de Durnford v., xl, 5–11
 — Richard Maille v., 11–17
 — references to, xxxii, 56, 69
 Boylonde, Boylund. *See* Boyland
 Boynon, William, 31, 45
 Boyville, William de, sheriff of Bedfordshire, 27
 Bradewyndelesoure. *See* Broadwinsor
 Bradford, John de, clerk to the *auditores querelarum*, xiv
 Bray, Henry de, escheator and justice of the Jews: Alice, daughter of Hugh de Broadwinsor, v., 17, 18
 — history of, xxxii–xxxiii
 — imprisonment of, xiii
 Breton, John le, warden of London: Ralph de Honey Lane v., xxiv, 12, 13
 Brimbleschote, William de, sheriff of Hampshire, xlv
 Bristol, 8, 9, 46
 — hall at, xl
 — mayor of, xxvii
 Broadwinsor, Alice, daughter of Hugh de, 17, 18
 — Hugh de, 17
 Broadwinsor, Dorset, 17, 18
 Brodewyndelesoures. *See* Broadwinsor
 Bromholme. *See* Broomholme
 Brompton, William de, justice: Geoffrey de Aqua v., xlv
 — Robert de Botyndone v., xlii
 — Henry de la Legh and Nicholas de Cerne v., xlv, 27–40
 — Abbot of Roche v., 1–5
 — Roger de Thornton v., 18–23
 — history of, xxxi
 — imprisonment of, xiii
 — references to, xliii, 40, 41, 42, 45, 98
 Broomholme, Prior of, 68–70
 — Priory, *see under* Abbeys and Priors
 Brun, Roger, 8
 Bygod. *See* Bigod
 Bukleswade, Bykleswade. *See* Biggleswade
 Bureforde. *See* Burford
 Burford, Oxon., 26
 Burnell, Robert, Bishop of Bath and Wells, Chancellor, *auditor querelarum*, xii
 — references to, xxi, xxii, xxiv
 Bury St. Edmunds, Abbey, *see under* Abbeys and Priors
 — Abbot of, xl, 49–51
 — Liberty of, 49
 Buston, William de, 53
 Butley Priory. *See under* Abbeys and Priors
 — Thomas, Prior of, v. John de Lovetot, 62–67
 CALDBECK, Cumberland, 81
 — Walter de, 81–83
 Calendar, 1289–1293, xx
 Camville, William de, merchant, 46–68
 Canvile. *See* Camville
 Candlewick Street, London, 26
 Candoweke. *See* Candlewick
 Canterbury, Archbishop of, 16

- Cave, John de, clerk to Ralph de Hengham, 34
 — William de Saham *v.*, xiv, xxxii, 40-45
 Cerne, Nicholas de, xxv, xxxix, xlv, 27-40, 40, 41, 44, 45
 Cernes. *See* Cerne
 Certeseye. *See* Chertsey
 Chann, John, 31, 45
 — Simon le, 31, 45
 Chapeleyn, John le, 18
 Charteseie. *See* Chertsey
 Chelmersforde. *See* Chelmsford
 Chelmsford, Essex, 55, 58, 59, 60
 Cherry Hinton, Cambridgeshire, 19
 Chertsey, John de, clerk to William de Brompton : John, son of Roger de Reed, *v.*, xx, xxxvi, 24, 25
 — Richard de, xxxvi, 24, 25
 Chester, John de, clerk to Ralph de Hengham : Henry le Keu *v.*, 25-27
 Chichester, Sussex, xlv
 Child, William le, 31, 45
 Chroniclers' Account of the Trials, xxxiv
 Cite, Robert le, 31, 45
 Clackclose hundred, Norfolk, 15
 Clackclose. *See* Clackclose
 Clipston, Nottinghamshire, 84
 Cnoveille, Bogo de, *auditor querelarum* in the City of London, 79
 Cobham, John de, justice, xlv, 60
 Cokham. *See* Cookham
 Colchester, Essex, 56, 58, 59
 Colecestre. *See* Colchester
 Colmorde, John, son of John de, 31, 45
 Commission, Terms of the, xxvi-xxix
 Condat, dep. Gironde, 48
 Conuers, John le, keeper of the Palace, 86
 Cookham, Clement de, 54, 55, 57, 58
 Cornwall, Edmund Earl of, 71, 76, 77
 Court crier (Henry de Coco), xxvi
 Court of Inquiry. *See* *Auditores Querelarum*
 Courtrai, Battle of, 94
 Cressingham, Hugh de, justice, 15
 Crestyen, Robert, 21, 22
 Crevquer, Robert le, 31, 45
 Croppery. *See* Cropredy
 Cropredy, Oxfordshire, 85
 — Peter de, 85-89
 Cropredy, Simon de, 85-89
 Crosby Ravensworth, Westmoreland, 81
 Crossey Ravenswart. *See* Crosby Ravensworth
 Culeforde. *See* Culford
 Culford, Suffolk, 8
 Cundac. *See* Condat
 DARWIN, WILLIAM, of Devon, 53
 Darwyne. *See* Darwin
 Deerhurst, Gloucestershire, 6
 Denemawe. *See* Dunmow
 Derhist. *See* Deerhurst
 Derneforde. *See* Durnford
 Diss, Norfolk, 62, 63
 Doget, Margery, wife of Roger, xlv
 — Roger, xlv
 Donemawe. *See* Dunmow
 Dublin, 46-48
 Dunmow, Gilbert, son of William de, 54
 55, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61
 — Ralph, son of William de, 58
 — William, brother of Gilbert de, 58
 — William, son of Gilbert de, 58
 Durham, John de, 58
 Durnford, Wiltshire, 5-11
 — William de, xl, 5-11
 Durrant, Richard, xxvii
 Dylewyke, Henry de, 31, 45
 EASTWOOD, Essex, letters dated at, 73
 Beckhout, monastery of, 94
 Ellesword, Simon de, parson of Thrapston, 78
 Ellingestoke, Ellyngestoke. *See* Stoke Charity
 Ely, Bishop of. *See* Kirkby; Louth
 Enveyse, William le, 54, 55, 58
 Envoyse. *See* Enveyse
 Error in conduct of cases, xxxix
 Estwode. *See* Eastwood
 Exeter Castle, xli, 51-52
 — janitor of (Richard de Paulesholte), 52
 Exeter, churchyard of St. Peter at, 51
 — constable of (Roger de Lincoln), 51-53
 Exmouth, John de, 31, 45
 FALSE ENROLMENTS, cases of, xlii
 Favour and Maintenance, cases of, xxxix
 Fines of the Chief Offenders, xxxviii

- Flamville, Henry de, 31, 45
 Fleet, Flete. *See under* Prisons
 Florence, merchants of, 78
 Fodringeseghe. *See* Fotheringhay
 Forester, William le, bailiff of Ospring :
 Katharine de la Ryole v., xlv
 Fors, Isabella de. *See* Albemarle,
 Countess of
 Fotheringhay, Northamptonshire, 81
 — Richard de, 81, 83
 Frankeleyn, Fraunkeleyn. *See* Franklin
 Franklin, Simon, 31, 45
 Fraunceys, Adam le, parson of Asby, 82
 — John, son of William le, 81, 83
 — John le, 82
 — Richard le, 81
 — William le, 81
 Fulk, parson of Bardwell, 68
 — Robert, son of, itinerant justice, 68
- GASCONY, stay of Edward I. in, 1286—
 1289, xi, xxvi, 74
 Gateshill, Suffolk, 68
 Giffard, Robert, 61
 Gildeforde. *See* Guildford
 Giselham, William de, justice, 15, 80
 Gloucester, Earl of, xl, 6—9
 — Statute of. *See under* Statutes
 Gnateshale. *See* Knettishall
 Goodman, Roger, 90, 91
 Gosefelde, Richard de, 20
 Gotheleforde, James de, 11
 Grimeshowe. *See* Grimshoe
 Grimshoe hundred, Norfolk, 15
 Guichard, Bishop of Troyes, xxxvii
 Guildford, Henry de, clerk to John de
 Lovetot, 57, 59, 61
 Guildhall, London, 79
 Gwent, bailiff of (Henry de Bray), xxxii
 Gwyhalda. *See* Guildhall
 Gyselham. *See* Giselham
- HAMBLE, river in Hampshire, 4
 Hamle. *See* Hamble
 Hanville, Benedict de, 85
 Hanytone, Simon de, 87
 Harcla. *See* Harclay
 Harclay, Michael de, 81, 82
 Harlow, Essex, 53—61
 — John, son of Hubert de, 53—61
 — Richard, son of William de, 55, 57,
 60, 61
 Harper, William le, 31, 45
- Haspey, William de, 31, 45
 Hastings, Thomas de, 81
 Haukesdone, Stephen de, 70
 Hauteyn, Hamo, justice, 12
 Hegham, Roger de, *narrator* to Roger
 de Thornton, 20, 21
 Hemmesby, Richard de, bailiff of Prior
 of Butley, 63, 65
Hengham Magna, 93
Hengham Parva, 93
 Hengham, Ralph de, Chief Justice of
 King's Bench : William de Bardwell
 v., xl, xli, 49—51
 — William de Camville v., 46—48
 — Henry de la Legh and Nicholas de
 Cerne v., 27—40
 — history of, xxx
 — imprisonment and fine of, xiii
 — references to, 3, 25—27, 45, 80, 81, 82
 Henrica, wife of Richard Maille, 12, 14
 Henry, Hugh, son of, 18—23
 Hercle. *See* Harclay
 Herizarde, Robert, 80
 Herlawe. *See* Harlow
 Hert, John le, 6
 Hertford, Robert de, xxiv
 Hilton, Huntingdonshire, 77
 Holbroke, Richard de, 71, 72, 73
 — *auditor querelarum* in the city of
 London, 79
 Honey Lane, Ralph de, xxiv, xxv
 Honilane. *See* Honey Lane
 Hopton, Walter de, 40
 Huberd, John. *See* Harlow
 Hugh, once parson of Tempsford, 28
 29, 45
 — Ralph, son of, 28, 29
 — Richard, son of, 28, 29
 — Hugh, son of, 28, 29—32, 45
 Hugh, son of Henry, 18—23
 Hundred, Adam, bailiff of Dublin, 46, 48
 Hyltone. *See* Hilton
 Hyntone. *See* Cherry Hinton
- INGE, WILLIAM, *qui sequitur pro rege*,
 xxv, 74
 Intimidation, instance of, xl
 Iovene. *See* Jeune
 Ireland, 23, 46—48
 Irish Sea, 19
 Isaac, Jew, 12, 14
 Iune. *See* Jeune
 Ivingho, Ralph de, 88

- JEUNE, JOHN LE, 31, 45
 -- Robert le, 81, 83
 John, John, son of, 19
 John, son of John de Colmorde, 31, 45
 Jovene. *See* Jeune
 Judges, disgrace of the, xiii
 Julian, Richard, son of. *See* Harlow
 Juge. *See* Inge
- KANVILLE. *See* Camville
 Keu, Agnes, wife of Henry le, 25-27
 -- Henry le, 25-27
 -- Ralph le, 57
 King's Lynn, Norfolk, 15
 Kirkby, John, Bishop of Ely, 1
 Knettishall, Suffolk, 68
 Kynelyn, Walter, 9
 Kyngesclipestone. *See* Clipston
 Kyppe, Henry, de Merynch, 9
- LACY, HENRY. *See* Lincoln, Earl of
 Latimer, William le, *auditor querelorum*, xii, xxi, xxii, xxiii, xxiv, 7, 38, 44
 Latymer. *See* Latimer
 Laundiche. *See* Launditch
 Launditch hundred, Norfolk, 15
 Laundres. *See* London
 Lecite, Robert. *See* Cite, Robert le
 Ledet, Richard, 55
 Legh, Henry de la, xxiv, xxv, xxxix, xlv, 27-40, 41, 44, 45
 -- John, son of Robert de la, xlv
 Leicester Abbey. *See under* Abbeys and Priories
 -- Abbot of, 92
 -- Peter de, *auditor querelorum*, xxiii, xxiv, 8, 20, 40
 -- Roger de, xiii, xxxii, 56, 98
 Lenne. *See* King's Lynn
 Lewes, Sussex, xlv
 Leycestre, Leycestria. *See* Leicester
 Leye. *See* Legh
 Lichfield, Henry de, clerk to the *auditores querelorum*, xv
 Lilleshall Abbey. *See under* Abbeys and Priories
 -- Abbot of, xxvi
 Lincoln, Earl of (Henry Lacy), *auditor querelorum*, xii, xxi-xxiv, 38, 78
 -- Eustace de, of Devon, 53
 -- Roger de, constable of Devon : Thomas Silvester v., xli, xlii, 51-53
 Lincoln, Thomas de, 25, xiii, xxxii, 98
 London, privileges of, xxiv, xxv, 79
 -- Alaric or Almaric de, 31, 45
 Lothingland hundred, Suffolk, xxvii
 Louth, William de, Bishop of Ely, *auditor querelorum*, xii, xxi, xxii, xxiv
 Louth. *See* Lowther
 Lovetot, John de, justice : William de Bardwell v., 49-51
 -- Thomas, Prior of Butley, v., 62-67
 -- John, son of Hubert de Harlow, v., 53-61
 -- imprisonment and fine of, xiii
 -- references to, xxxii, xl, 98
 Lowther, Hugh de, *qui sequitur pro rege*, xxv
 -- narrator for Roger de Thornton, 20, 21
 Ludham, Robert de, justice, 12
 Lundres, Alaric de. *See* London
- MADLE, WILLIAM, senior, 57
 Magna Charta, judgment given contrary to, 50
 Maille, Henrica, wife of Richard, 12, 14
 -- Richard, of Stokeferry, 11-17
 Malerbe, Richard, 31, 45
 Malet, Robert, 95
 Malherb. *See* Malerbe
 Malie, Malle, Malye. *See* Maille
 March, William de, treasurer, *auditor querelorum*, xii, xxi, xxii, 40, 61
 Marchia, de. *See* March.
 Marlborough, Statute of. *See under* Statutes
 Matching, Essex, 54, 58, 59
 Matchynges. *See* Matching
 Mayle, Maylle. *See* Maille
 Maunsel, William, 31, 45
 Meaburn Maulds, Westmoreland, 81
 Mebrunmalde. *See* Meaburn Maulds
 Merke, Ralph le, 55
 Merynch, Henry Kyppe de, 9
 Metingham, John de, 77
 Middeltone. *See* Middleton
 Middleton, Peter de, 89
 -- William de, justice, 60
 Minister, definition of the word, xxvii, xxviii
 Missa de Potatoribus, 94
 Montague, Simon de, 51, 53
 Monte Acuto, de. *See* Montague

- Mordant, William, 31, 45
 Moreville, Robert de, 84
 Mortmain, Statute of. *See under*
 Statutes
- Narratio de Passione Justiciariorum.*
See Passion
- Netley Abbey. *See under* Abbeys
 Neugate. *See* Newgate
 Newcastle-on-Tyne, 82, 84
 Newenham, John de, xlv
 Newgate, 91
 Newgate prison. *See under* Prisons
 Nicholas, brother of Amice de Golding-
 ton, 81, 83
 Norfolk, Earl of (Roger Bigod), xlv
 Norham, near Berwick, letters dated at,
 75
 Northampton Castle, 86
 Norwich, 14, 15
 — Archdeacon of. *See* Scarning
 — John de, 13
 Note, Richard, 25
- OFFENDERS, nature of the, xxvii-xxix
 — the great, xxix-xxxiii
 Officium Coronatoris, 1275, xii
 Oxtun, James de, 53
 Oyldeboef, Hugh, 31, 45
 Oysel, Henry, 11
- PAGEHAM, WILLIAM DE, justice, 63, 64
 Parodies, instances of mediæval, 94
 Passion of the Judges, the, vii, 93-99;
 manuscripts of the, 93, 94
 Passions, instances of, 94
 Paulesholte, Richard de, janitor of
 Exeter Castle, 52
 Paynel, John, 1, 3, 4, 85
 — Philip, 4, 5
 Peche, John, xlv
 Pereville, John, son of Peter de, 53, 54,
 60, 61
 — Peter de, 53, 54
 Philip IV. of France, xxxvii
 Picheforde, Geoffrey de, 73-75
 Pickering, John de, 63, 64
 Plan of the Book, xliii
 Ponthieu, 59
 Pontoise, John de, Bishop of Winchester,
auditor querelarum, xii, xxi-xxiv,
 20, 44, 65, 66, 74, 77
 Pontyn, William, 55
- Porchester Castle, xxii
 Porthorse, John, son of John, 21
 Preston, Richard de, 84
 Prisons:
 Basinghall, 32
 Fleet, 32, 33
 Newgate, 32, 33
 Tower of London, 61, 87
 Provost, Edric, grandfather of Osbert
 le, 62
 — Humphrey, father of Osbert le, 62,
 65
 — Martin, son of Osbert le, 62, 63
 64, 65, 66, 67
 — Matilda, wife of Martin, son of
 Osbert le, 62
 — Osbert le, 62, 65, 66, 67
 Pycheforde. *See* Picheforde
 Pykeringes. *See* Pickering
 Pyngin, Robert, 9
- QUARR, Abbey. *See under* Abbeys and
 Priors
- RAGEMAN, Statute of. *See under*
 Statutes
 Ralph, cook of Clement de Cookham, 58
 — son of Hugh de Tempsford, 28, 29
 Ramesey, John de, 24
 Reda, Reed, John, son of Roger de.
See Reed
 Red, Robert le, xl, 5, 7, 9
 Rede, Robert le. *See* Red, Robert le
 Reed, Suffolk, 24, 25
 — Isabella, mother of John de, 25
 — John, son of Roger de, xxxvi, 24, 25
 Richard, son of Hugh de Tempsford,
 28, 29
 — son of Julian. *See* Harlow, Richard
 de
 Rivers, John de, steward of, xxviii
 Roche Abbey. *See under* Abbeys and
 Priors
 — Abbot of, xxxix, 1-5
 Rochester, Solomon-de, justice: Richard
 Maille v., 11-17
 — Henry, son of Nicholas of St.
 Edmunds, v., 67-70
 — history of, xiii, xxxi
 Roffa, de, *see* Rochester
 Rokesle, Geoffrey de, Keeper of the
 Exchange: Hugh le Taylor v.,
 78-80

- Roland, Geoffrey, 31, 45
 Rolaunde. *See* Roland
 Rolls, description of the, xiv-xxi
 Ronhale, John de, complaint of, xl
 Roolande. *See* Roland
 Rothing, William de, constable of Essex, 54, 55
 Rous, Robert le. *See* Rede
 Rowelle, Robert de, 4, 5
 Roxby, Lincolnshire, 1
 Roxebi. *See* Roxby
 Rupe. *See* Roche
 Ryole, Katharine de la, xlv
 Ryvers. *See* Rivers
- SAFFRON WALDEN, ESSEX, 56
 Saham, William de, justice: *v.* John de Cave, xiv, xxxii, 40-45
 — Roger Doget and Margery his wife *v.*, xlv
 — Henry de la Legh and Nicholas de Cerne *v.*, 27-40
 — Robert, son of Simon de Stanton, *c.*, 71-77
 — history of, xiii, xxxi, xxxii
 St. Edmunds. *See* Bury St. Edmunds
 — Abbey. *See* under Abbeys
 — Henry, son of Nicholas de, 67-70
 St. Evroult. *See* under Abbeys and Priors
 St. John, John de, *auditor querelarum*, xii, xxi, xxii, xxiii, 38
 St. Peter, churchyard of, Exeter, 51
 Saintes, dep. Charente-Inférieure, letters dated at, 72
 Samford hundred, Suffolk, 68, 70
 Sandwich, Ralph de, keeper of the Tower: Hugh le Taylor *v.*, 78-80
 Saunforde. *See* Samford
 Scarning, Thomas de, Archdeacon of Norwich, *auditor querelarum*, xxiii, xxiv
 Schuldham. *See* Shouldham
 Sedgfield, Durham, 80
 — Thomas de: Robert Herizarde *v.*, 80
 Segefild. *See* Sedgfield
 Segrave, Nicholas de, 71-73, 75, 77
 Sheldham. *See* Shouldham
 Shouldham, Norfolk, 12
 — Prior of, 12, 13, 16
 — Priory. *See* under Abbeys and Priors
- Shrepham, Adam de, 12, 13
 Shuldham. *See* Shouldham
 Silvester, Thomas, bailiff of the King, the Countess of Albemarle, and Simon de Montague, xli, xlii, 51-53
 Skernygges. *See* Scarning
 Snodland, xxxi
 Socke, Thomas le, attorney for Legh and Cerne, 39
 Sodington, Thomas de, justice, xxxii, 36, 41, 69
 Somertone. *See* West Somerton
 Southwick, Northamptonshire, 88, 89
 Spring, Adam, 81
 Stamford, Lincolnshire, tournament at, 20
 Stanford, Thomas de, sub-esccheator of Middlesex: John de Newenham *v.*, xlv
 Stanton, Fen, Huntingdonshire, 71
 — Robert, son of Simon de, 71-77
 — Simon de, 71-77
 Stapleton, Nicholas de, justice: fine of, 40
 — Thomas and Amice de Goldington *v.*, 81-84
 Statutes:
 Acton Burnell, 1283, 86
 Gloucester, 1278, xii
 Marlborough, 1267, 2
 Mortmain, 1279, 68, 59
 Rageman, 276, xii
 Westminster I., 1275, xii
 — II., 1285, xii, 2, 37
 Staunford. *See* Stamford
 Stoke Charity, Hampshire, 17, 18
 Stoke Ferry, Norfolk, 12
 — Richard Maille of, 11-17
 Stokeferye. *See* Stoke Ferry
 Stouemarket. *See* Stowmarket
 Stowmarket, Suffolk, 10
 Stratford Abbey. *See* under Abbeys and Priors
 Stratton, Adam de, Chamberlain of the Exchequer: Peter de Cropredy *v.*, 85, 89
 — Roger Goodman of Bermondsey *v.*, 90, 91
 — history of, xiii, xxx, xxxi
 — references to, xvi, xxix, 96, 98
 Stratton, William de, 86, 87
 Stretford, Laurence de, 88
 Sudyngtone. *See* Sodington

- Sutton, William de, undersheriff of Essex, 58, 59
 Sutwelle, Suwelle. *See* Southwick
 Swithin, St., church of, 26
- TEMESFORD. *See* Tempsford
 Templars, Trials of the, xxxvii
 Tempsford, Bedfordshire, 28-32, 33, 38, 45
 Tempsford, Ralph, son of Hugh de, 28-31
 — Richard, son of Hugh de, 28-31, 33
 — William, son of Hugh de, 28-32, 34, 35, 37, 40, 41
 Terms, Law, 1289-1293, xxi
 Thames, River, 86, 87
 Themesforde. *See* Tempsford
 Thornburgh, Roland de, 84
 Thornetone. *See* Thornton
 Thornton, Gilbert de, 4, 7, 8, 10, 51, 72, 75, 76; Roger de, xxv, 18-23
 Thrapston, Northamptonshire, 78
 Thyville, William, 31, 45
 Tickhill, Nicholas de, clerk to the *auditores querelarum*, xv
 Tisson, Robert, 53
 Tower. *See* Prisons
 Tracy, John, coroner of Essex, 54, 55, 58, 60
 Trapestone. *See* Thrapston
 Trials, duration of the, xx
 Tyle, William de, 84
 Tyingtone, William de, 12, 13
 Thyville. *See* Thyville
- VALLIBUS, JOHN DE, justice, 33, 75, 77
 Violence, Cases of, xli, xlii
- WALDENE. *See* Saffron Walden
 Wallingford, Mayor of, xxvii
 Wareyn, William, attorney of Abbot of St. Evroult, 91
 Warin, King's bailiff in Essex, 54, 55
 Warre, Robert, 9
 Warwick, Nicholas de, narrator to Roger de Thornton, 20, 21
 — *qui sequitur pro rege*, xxv
 Warwyke. *See* Warwick
- Wastdale, Cumberland, 81
 — Geoffrey de, 81, 83
 Westminster: Chapel of receipt at, 86
 — Hall, 32, 88
 — Statutes of. *See* under Statutes
 — stone cross at, 87
 West Somerton, Norfolk, 62, 66, 67
 Weyland, Thomas de, Chief Justice of Common Pleas: William de Bardwell v., 49-51
 — Abbot of St. Evroult v., 91-92
 — history of, xiii, xxix-xxx
 — references to, xli, 4, 60, 95, 98
 Weylaunde. *See* Weyland
 Wheteringes, Hugh de, 12, 13
 Wicken, Suffolk, 67
 Widdington, Essex, 54
 — William le Enveyse de, 54, 55, 58
 Widford, Hertfordshire, 90, 91
 Wilbraham, Great, Cambridgeshire, 19, 20
 — Little, Cambridgeshire, 19, 20
 William, clerk, parson of Bardwell, 68
 — son of Hugh, once parson of Tempsford, 28-32, 34, 35, 37, 40, 41
 Winburne, Walter de, justice, 27, 41
 Winchester, Bishop of. *See* Pontoise, John of
 — Simon de, xlvi
 Winsor, Geoffrey, son of John de, 17, 18
 — John de, 17, 18
 Wixamtree hundred, Bedfordshire, 28
 Wokingdon, Nicholas de, 61
 — Richard de, 60
 Wokingdone. *See* Wokingdon
 Wolneric, father of Edric, 62
 Wonford hundred, Devon, Court of, 52
 Wyham. *See* Wykham
 Wydeforde. *See* Widford
 Wykham, John de, xl, 6, 7, 9
 Wyke. *See* Wicken
 Wydyngton, Wydyton. *See* Widdington
 Wylburgham, Magna et Parva. *See* Wilbraham
 Wynforde. *See* Wonford
 Wyndlesoure. *See* Winsor
 Wythlmenhale, Nicholas de, 87
 Wyxstonstre. *See* Wixamtree





1874
1875
1876

NOTES OF THE
LIBRARY OF THE
MUSEUM OF
COMPARATIVE ZOOLOGY
AT HARVARD UNIVERSITY
CAMBRIDGE, MASS.

WITHDRAWN
FROM STOCK
QMUL LIBRARY



